



**Illinois Department  
of Transportation**

## **THE SPRING 2012 ILLINOIS MOTORIST OPINION SURVEY**

*Conducted for*  
**Illinois Department of Transportation**

*Conducted by*



**Survey Research Office  
Center for State Policy and Leadership  
University of Illinois Springfield (UIS)**

### **SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

Report on Survey Results: July, 2012

***Report prepared by:***

Richard Schuldt

*Director, UIS Survey Research Office*

***Survey conducted with particular assistance from  
the following staff of the UIS Survey Research Office:***

Valerie Howell, *Interviewing Lab Manager, Data Input Management*

Alan J. Simmons, *Research Assistant*

## Introduction

The Illinois Department of Transportation contracted with the Survey Research Office, located within the Center for State Policy and Leadership, of the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) to conduct a mail-out Motorist Opinion Survey in the Spring of 2012. Similar surveys have been conducted for the Department in every year since 2001.

In 2001, surveys were conducted in both the Spring and Fall. From 2002 through 2007, the surveys were conducted in the Spring while the 2008 survey was conducted in the Summer. The 2009 through 2011 surveys were all conducted in the Fall.

Staff of the UIS Survey Research Office offered advice concerning final question wording, assisted in developing the specific methodology (see below), implemented the data collection procedures (see below) and data input, and analyzed the results.

## Methodology

**The sample.** For the recent Spring 2012 survey, a stratified sample of random Illinois household addresses was purchased from Genesys Sampling Systems, one of the leading vendors of samples in the country. (This sampling methodology is known as address-based sampling, or ABS.) For each of the selected addresses, Genesys Sampling Systems provided a “matched” household name, if available (88%), and also provided a telephone number if available (50%).<sup>1</sup> For the 2012 survey, only households with a “matched” name were sent surveys.

The final sample (with “matched” names) was stratified by IDOT region, with 2,000 household addresses randomly selected from District 1, and 1,920 from the remaining eight downstate districts (240 in each of the eight districts). Thus, a grand total of 3,920 randomly-selected household names/addresses were in the original sample.

It should be noted that this sampling methodology was virtually the same as that used in the last two years but different from that used in previous surveys in this series.<sup>2</sup> For all surveys previous to 2009 in this series, a stratified sample of “listed” Illinois households (households listed in telephone directories) was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc., another one of the leading vendors of samples in the country. The ABS methodology, available only relatively recently and the one selected for the 2009 through 2012 surveys, has the advantage of including households with unlisted phone numbers as well as households with only cell phones and households with no phones.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Availability of the telephone number is useful as a rough indicator of households that are “listed households” (listed in the telephone directories).

<sup>2</sup> In 2009, surveys were also sent to addresses without “matched” names (sent to Current Resident). Because of the lack of personalization for these addresses (and the accompanying relatively low response rate that resulted from this group last year), it was decided to forego sending surveys to these addresses in 2010 through 2012.

<sup>3</sup> In the initial Spring 2001 survey, the sample was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. rather than selected from the Secretary of State’s list of licensed drivers because of time considerations. From 2002 through 2008, the

In all years, the sampling methodology has included district stratification. As noted above, 3,920 households were sent questionnaires in the recent 2012 survey, somewhat less than the 3,950 households sent surveys in 2011 – and slightly more than the nearly 3,900 households sent surveys in 2010. In 2007 through 2009, 3,800 households/ household addresses were selected for the sample (2,000 for District 1 and 225 for each of the eight downstate districts). In the earlier years, 3,520 households were selected, with downstate districts 2 through 9 each containing 190 rather than 225 households. The initial household sample size for District 1 has remained the same (2,000 for each survey).<sup>4</sup>

**Data collection procedures.** Each original sample member was sent an initial survey package in on either May 7 or 8, 2012.<sup>5</sup> These initial packages consisted of a personalized letter over the signature of IDOT’s Director of Communications, a four-page questionnaire in booklet form, and a postage-paid return envelope addressed to the UIS-SRO in an outside envelope with the IDOT logo.<sup>6</sup> The survey package was sent to “the household of” that particular name.

About one week after this initial mailing, a postcard thank-you / reminder was sent to all sample members. And, about two weeks after the postcard, a follow-up survey package was sent to non-respondents. This follow-up survey package was similar in composition to the first survey package.<sup>7</sup>

A web-based version of the questionnaire was introduced in 2008 and has been continued in all surveys since then. In all U.S. mail correspondence with sample members, we informed them that they could complete a web-based version of the questionnaire that could be accessed by going to a particular web-site address.

Another variation in the methodology across the surveys relates to who in the household we ask to complete the questionnaire. The changes here results from attempts to increase the number of younger respondents (who have always been under-represented in these surveys),

---

decision to proceed with samples of listed households was been driven by the desire to maintain consistency in this aspect of the methodology, particularly since a purpose of these surveys is to assess changes over time. However, in recent years, it has become feasible to purchase a random sample of household addresses and match names to these addresses. Because this methodology includes broader coverage of relevant households – and because we could include questions which would allow a measurement of “listed households” (thus allowing for the analysis of comparable results), we decided to use the ABS methodology for the 2009 through 2012 surveys.

<sup>4</sup> With one exception, the surveys in all years of this series have been cross-sectional surveys. The exception here was that of the Spring 2002 survey. In that survey, both a cross-sectional sample (such as this) and a panel design (following up on those who responded in the Fall 2001 survey) were used. Because the cross-sectional portion of this design was thought to better represent licensed drivers, the original cross-sectional sampling design was selected for subsequent surveys.

<sup>5</sup> The 2009 through 2011 Motorist Surveys were the first surveys since one of the two surveys in 2001 to have been conducted in the Fall. Most of the earlier surveys had been conducted in mid-Spring. However, the 2008 Motorist Survey was conducted in the Summer.

<sup>6</sup> The survey packages were the same as those for all the earlier surveys, with the exception of the inclusion of focus group participation forms in the Fall 2001 survey packages.

<sup>7</sup> As noted above, initial survey packages were mailed on May 7 and 8. Postcard reminders were mailed May 16, and follow-up survey packages to non-respondents were mailed June 1, 2012.

as well as increasing the respondent pool from only licensed drivers to all adults, as topical questions became more relevant to the latter in the last few years. We have tried to accomplish these changes while at the same time keeping cross-time comparisons valid and meaningful.

In the three cross-sectional surveys prior to 2003, we asked the licensed driver with the next birthday to complete the questionnaire in order to “randomly” vary the characteristics of the respondent.

In the Spring 2003 through 2007 surveys, we explicitly asked for the youngest licensed driver in the household to complete the survey in a random half of the sample, while still asking for the licensed driver with the next birthday in the other half.

For the 2008 survey, we asked for the youngest licensed driver in the household for all sample members.

For the 2009 survey, we followed the 2008 practice of asking for the youngest licensed driver. *But for households without licensed drivers*, we also asked for the youngest adult (18 years of age or older) to complete the survey if there was no licensed driver in the household. As was also the case in 2008, we asked for the licensed driver / household member with the next birthday if the youngest was not available.

For the 2010 and 2012 surveys, we asked for the youngest adult at least 18 years old to complete the survey. We then asked for the household member with the next birthday if the youngest was not available. We did this to make the instructions more simple.<sup>8</sup>

**Returns and response rate.** Through July 10, 2012, 1,078 usable and unique surveys had been returned to the Survey Research Office. Just under 7 percent (n = 72) of these questionnaires were completed through the web-version of the questionnaire. The total number of completed questionnaires represents almost 28 percent (27.5%) of the initial sample. Excluding sample members no longer in the relevant populations or to whom mail was undeliverable, the cooperation rate becomes 30 percent (30.2%). As usual, the cooperation rate is higher in the downstate districts – 36 percent (36.1%) – than in the Chicago metro area’s District 1 – just under one-quarter (24.4%). Within the Chicago area’s District 1, further analysis shows a much greater cooperation rate in the suburban areas (27%) than in the City of Chicago (16.9%). Within the downstate Districts, the cooperation rate is 36 to 37 percent for all districts but three: District 3 (Ottawa) and District 4 (Peoria), which are slightly lower at 33 and 34 percent, respectively; and District 7 (Effingham), which is slightly greater at just over 39 percent. Relevant response rate and cooperation rate numbers for the total sample and by IDOT district (and within District, by Chicago vs. suburbs) are presented in Table 1 below.

**Trend in response rate.** Over the past ten years, the response rate has declined from over 40 percent to about 30 percent. This decline accords with the experience of general survey research throughout this time period. It is also the case that the response rate over the past four years (2009 through 2012), coinciding with the use of ABS sampling, shows a decline from that of 2008, the last year when sampling from directory-listed households was used (36% to

---

<sup>8</sup> The only “negative” here was that 16 and 17-year-old licensed drivers would not be eligible. However, extremely few respondents in this age group had responded over the course of the surveys. For the record, two 16 or 17-year olds did respond to the 2011 questionnaire – and to the 2012 questionnaire. They were left in the data base because of the difficulty we have in obtaining a sufficient number of younger drivers.

percentages bordering 30% in the past four years). However, at the same time, the ABS sampling frame uses a much more inclusive list of households, and thus an overall improvement in the sampling methodology for the Motorist Opinion Survey project.

**Table 1**  
**Estimated Response Rates,**  
**Total and by IDOT District**  
 (returns/completions through 7/10/12)

District		Original number	Mail problems & out of popul.*	Remain- ing number	Returns/ comple- tions	"Initial" Response Rate (base: all)	Coopera- tion Rate (base: Remain- ing)
1	Schaumburg	2,000	179	1,821	445	22.3%	24.4%
(1)	City Chicago	550	83	467	79	14.4%	16.9%
(1)	Suburbs	1,450	96	1,354	366	25.2%	27.0%
2	Dixon	240	27	213	79	32.9%	37.1%
3	Ottawa	240	21	219	73	30.4%	33.3%
4	Peoria	240	24	216	74	30.8%	34.3%
5	Paris	240	16	224	81	33.8%	36.2%
6	Springfield	240	14	226	81	33.8%	35.8%
7	Effingham	240	23	217	85	35.4%	39.2%
8	Collinsville	240	25	215	78	32.5%	36.3%
9	Carbondale	240	18	222	82	34.2%	36.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3,920</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>3,573</b>	<b>1,078</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>
1		2,000	179	1,821	445	22.3%	24.4%
2 - 9		1,920	168	1,752	633	33.0%	36.1%

## The questionnaire

The questionnaire was in the format of a four-page booklet. It contained questions that have been part of the survey series since its inception, and as usual, it contained sections consisting of topical issue questions. Continuing questions are found on the first two pages and on the back page of the questionnaire. (See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire.)

In the first part of the questionnaire (pages 1 and 2), respondents were asked to rate various aspects of state highways and bridges under three main headings: maintaining highways and traffic flow; road repair and construction; and traveler services. Respondents were then asked about their awareness and use of the IDOT toll-free telephone number and website. And following this, they were asked to rate IDOT employees on four characteristics and to give a couple overall evaluations of IDOT (overall performance and frequency IDOT can be trusted to do what is right regarding transportation issues). They were also asked to assess IDOT's impact on their area's economy and overall quality of life.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The trust question was first asked in the Spring 2005 survey and in every survey since. The assessed impact questions have been asked in every survey since the Spring 2005 survey, except for 2006.

In the last part of the questionnaire (bottom 2/3 of page 4), respondents were asked selected “objective background” demographic and driving-related information. These included questions about the number of miles respondents drive per year and about their commuting time and miles. They were asked about their residential location as well as about their age, gender, education level, household income and race/ethnicity.<sup>10</sup> And, respondents were asked several questions so that we could identify those respondents who could have been selected under the sampling methodology used in previous years (e.g., whether or not the respondent is a licensed driver; whether they have a landline phone line and, if so, whether it is listed; and whether they have a cell phone).

This year’s topical issue questions focused on the topics of Amtrak and high-speed rail. Several of the questions in this topical section were also asked in the 2010 survey.

The first seven questions in this section dealt with Amtrak. These included questions about: how far away respondents are from an Amtrak city/station; how many times they have ridden an Amtrak train in the past 12 months in Illinois; the main reasons respondents would most likely travel by train in Illinois; the main reasons they do not regularly ride Amtrak when traveling; what changes in Amtrak service would get respondents to try using Amtrak service in Illinois; and whether – and where – respondents have seen/heard any advertising for Amtrak passenger train service in the last few months.

The last four questions in this section dealt with high-speed rail. These included questions about: how many times per year respondents would use high-speed rail on three selected routes; how much respondents favor or oppose high-speed rail in Illinois; how much they favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail; and whether a high-speed rail route from Chicago to St. Louis should go through the same cities as the current Amtrak Chicago-St. Louis route.

## **“Analysis” groups within the responding sample and sampling errors**

**Two “analysis” groups to be used in this report.** Results for the 2012 respondents have been run for two “analysis” groups, identified and described below with their respective “weighting” schemes.<sup>11</sup>

1. The total sample group (or the “total group”): all 2012 responding sample members, weighted by earlier estimates of licensed drivers by IDOT district.

---

<sup>10</sup> The 2011 survey was the first to include race/ethnicity in the demographic section.

<sup>11</sup> In the 2009 report, we also looked at results for those respondents who would have been in the sampling frame surveys conducted prior to 2009 – in other words, those respondents who had listed landline telephone numbers and who were licensed drivers (the “LLD group” in the 2009 report). However, we discovered that these results did not differ much at all from the results of the two analysis groups used in the 2010 and 2011 reports, and further, were based on about half as many respondents. Also, we found that the demographic characteristics for the 2009 “total group” were generally closer to the demographic characteristics in earlier surveys than were those for the “LLD group.” Thus, with the exception of one section, we did not see the need to analyze results from this sub-group in either 2010 or 2011. The exception, the section on evaluation of IDOT employees, was the one section where we found the greatest differences (albeit fairly small) between the “LLD group” and the total sample group in 2009.

2. The population-weighted group: all 2012 respondents, weighted by gender, age and education characteristics of the Illinois adult public as well as by area of the state (estimated adult population).

For the total group (or total sample group), weighting results “by IDOT district” (as has been done for every survey in the series) means that respondents have been weighted to reflect each district’s overall estimated proportion of licensed drivers. In the last few years, however, the results here are perhaps best thought of as those from respondents who travel on Illinois highways and roadways, whether they are drivers or passengers, since a few (5%) of the respondents are not licensed drivers. The targeted proportions for each district used in this weighting, as in the past reports, are: District 1 - Schaumburg (58.6%); District 2 - Dixon (8.8%); District 3 – Ottawa (5.9%); District 4 - Peoria (4.8%); District 5 - Paris (5.7%); District 6 – Springfield (5.3%); District 7 - Effingham (2.7%); District 8 - Collinsville (5.5%); and District 9 - Carbondale (2.8%).<sup>12</sup>

For the population-weighted (or “popul” or “popul-wgtd”) group, results have been weighted by area of the state, gender, age, education level, and race/ethnicity. This reflects a sample that is more demographically representative of the Illinois public as a whole.<sup>13</sup>

**Sampling errors.** For the results of these two groups which are based on all questionnaires returned (n of 1,078, for the total group and the population-weighted group), the sampling error for this survey is +/- 3 percent, at the 95 percent confidence level. That is, the percentage results for the full sample will be within about 3 percentage points of the actual population characteristics 95 percent of the time.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> For this weighting, the 2000 population Census figures for Illinois counties were used. However, the proportion of licensed drivers for the Chicago metro area was decreased somewhat from the population proportion because of two factors: 1) the likelihood that this area contains a higher proportion of households with no licensed driver; and 2) the likelihood that the population in this area contains a higher proportion of household members not old enough to drive. It is acknowledged that estimation is involved here; however, it should be noted that any small changes in this weighting will have no impact on the substantive results.

Because of the availability of updated 2010 census data, we did think about updating the licensed driver estimates. We did not do so for several reasons: 1) the earlier weighting scheme did not seem unreasonable, even given the updated information; 2) keeping the earlier weighting would allow greater comparability over time; and 3) small changes in the scheme would have very minimal effect on the results. Also note that the population-weighting scheme described below uses the more updated 2010 census data.

<sup>13</sup> For area of the state weighting, we used the 2010 population estimates for the City of Chicago, the Chicago suburbs (basically the rest of District 1), and each of the eight districts in downstate Illinois. The 2012 survey was the second to include the race/ethnicity question. The final weighting here does result in a statewide distribution that has somewhat fewer minorities than the actual population. But, note that the proportion of minorities in the adult population will be less than that for the population as a whole. And, there are limits to what weighting can do to overcome the actual respondent distribution.

<sup>14</sup> Note that this assumes a non-biased sampling frame and no bias in those who responded. The actual sampling error is just slightly over +/- 2.98%.

## **Relevant characteristics for two analysis groups and comparisons**

Table 2A below (p. 8) presents selected sample-relevant characteristics for both of the two analysis groups. It also presents similar information for only those who indicated being licensed drivers (also using the earlier district-based weighting scheme) and for those who indicated being licensed drivers AND who have listed landline telephone numbers (the group strictly comparable to survey samples prior to 2008, again using the earlier district-based weighting scheme).

## **Demographic and driving-related characteristics across the survey series**

Table 2B below (pp. 10-11) presents demographic and driving-related characteristics for the 2006 through 2012 surveys – using “Total Group” results for the most recent 2009 through 2012 surveys. Table 2C (pp. 12–13) presents similar information for the 2009 through 2012 surveys for both the “Total Group” results and the “Population-weighted” results.

Appendix B presents profiles of the respondents for selected demographic and driving-related characteristics from the 2003 survey through the 2008 survey.<sup>15</sup> Remember that the results in this time span are derived from a landline and telephone directory-based sample and are weighted only by IDOT district.

Together with Table 2B, it can be seen that there are some changes in the profiles across these years. (Here, the gender balance in 2008, 2010 and 2012 stands out in contrast to the skewness toward males in the other survey years.) But overall, there is a great deal of consistency. And at least some of the changes reflected here are the result of real changes in the Illinois population, not the artifact of differential response bias. Note that the first survey to ask about race/ethnicity was the 2011 survey.

---

<sup>15</sup> Information on these demographic characteristics for the earlier 2001 and 2002 survey years can be found in earlier reports. Their presentation here would not affect the overall point being made about the general consistency of respondent attributes across the survey years.

**Table 2A**  
**A Comparison of Possible Analysis Weighting Groups, 2012 Survey**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>2012 Listed, Licensed Drivers (District- weighted) (561)</b>	<b>2012 Licensed Drivers (District- weighted) (1,023)</b>	<b>2012 Total Group (District- weighted) (1,078)</b>	<b>2012 Population- Weighted (1,078)</b>
<b>“Comparable” group (listed &amp; licensed driver)</b>			<b>Analysis Groups in Report</b>	
Comparable to prior to 2009	100%	54%	<b>51%</b>	<b>45%</b>
Not in sampling frames prior to 2009	0%	46%	<b>49%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>District</b>				
Schaumburg (1)	57%	58%	<b>58%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Dixon (2)	7%	9%	<b>9%</b>	<b>7%</b>
Ottawa (3)	6%	6%	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>
Peoria (4)	5%	5%	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Paris (5)	6%	6%	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Springfield (6)	6%	5%	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Effingham (7)	3%	3%	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
Collinsville (8)	7%	6%	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>
Carbondale (9)	3%	3%	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Licensed driver</b>				
Yes, licensed	100%	100%	<b>95%</b>	<b>94%</b>
Not licensed/no answer	0%	0%	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Phones</b>				
<b>Landline</b>				
No landline	0%	25%	<b>24%</b>	<b>28%</b>
Listed landline	100%	54%	<b>52%</b>	<b>46%</b>
Unlisted landline	0%	18%	<b>18%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Unknown	0%	4%	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Cell phone</b>				
Have cell phone	93%	91%	<b>89%</b>	<b>89%</b>
<b>Combination</b>				
No phone	0%	2%	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Landline only	6%	5%	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Cell only	0%	25%	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>
Both land & cell	93%	66%	<b>64%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Unknown	1%	2%	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>

**What results should be used for the 2012 survey year: the total group results or the population-weighted results?** The 2012 total group results appear more useful when comparing the results from continuing questions across the survey years. And, as noted earlier, they can be said to reflect the perceptions and opinions of the Illinois adult public which travels Illinois' highways and roadways. However, the population-weighted group results have the advantage of offering a picture of current opinions of the Illinois public from a group with characteristics more representative of the Illinois adult public. For instance, and by intention (i.e., weighting), the gender distribution of the population-weighted results is more balanced and thus more representative. The age distribution, which is much younger, is also more representative as is the education distribution. The population-weighted results also shows more representation from the City of Chicago (because of estimates being based on adult population rather than licensed drivers.) And, the race/ethnicity distribution is more representative in this weighting scheme as well.

Because of these relative advantages, this report contains the following.

For the tables summarizing current 2012 results, both the total group results and the population-weighted group results are presented.

For questions that appeared in earlier surveys, the focus of the tables and in upcoming text will be on the 2012 total group results because of their advantage in being comparable to earlier years. However, we will comment on any meaningful differences that exist between the 2012 total group and population-weighted results. (Switching the focus back and forth as we moved from current results to comparative results here would be more confusing.)

For questions that are appearing for the first time in the 2012 survey, the focus of the upcoming text will be on the population-weighted results. Because these questions are relevant to the full public, these results have the advantage of being more representative.

It should be noted that the choices regarding results to be used -- along with the arguments presented above to justify these choices -- are, in large part, more theoretical than practical. While we believe it is necessary to justify these choices, for the most part we find few practical and meaningful differences in the 2012 results between these two groups.

**Table 2B**  
**Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2006 to 2012 (wgtd by District)**

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total (1016)	2010 Total (1140)	2011 Total (1058)	2012 Total (1078)
<b>Cooperation rate</b>	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%	29.6%	31.6%	29.0%	30.2%
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	54%	57%	50%	57%	50%	56%	51%
Female	46%	43%	50%	43%	50%	43%	49%
	(98%)	(97%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)
<b>Age</b>							
16 to 35	13%	12%	16%	12%	15%	14%	14%
36 to 45	16%	14%	12%	14%	12%	12%	12%
46 to 55	22%	21%	20%	21%	21%	20%	20%
56 to 65	22%	23%	21%	25%	23%	25%	26%
66 to 75	15%	18%	18%	16%	18%	18%	16%
Over 75	13%	12%	13%	12%	12%	11%	11%
Mean	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs	55.8 yrs	55.3 yrs	55.7 yrs	55.6 yrs
Median	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs
	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)
<b>Education</b>							
Up to HS	28%	28%	28%	26%	27%	27%	26%
Post HS	32%	33%	33%	35%	34%	33%	33%
4-yr college	39%	39%	40%	38%	39%	40%	41%
	(97%)	(96%)	(97%)	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)
<b>Income</b>							
< \$25,000	13%	12%	15%	16%	16%	14%	16%
\$25-49,999	27%	26%	24%	27%	25%	26%	23%
\$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%	22%	23%
\$75-100,000	16%	19%	18%	16%	18%	17%	18%
> \$100,000	17%	20%	20%	17%	18%	20%	20%
	(85%)	(85%)	(82%)	(83%)	(86%)	(86%)	(84%)
Up to \$49,999	40%	38%	39%	43%	41%	41%	39%
\$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%	22%	23%
\$75,000 and up	33%	39%	38%	33%	36%	37%	38%
<b>Miles drive / yr</b>							
Up to 6,000*	23%	19%	23%	26%	25%	22%	24%
6,000+ -12,000	36%	33%	37%	34%	37%	37%	36%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	32%	29%	27%	23%	26%	26%
Over 20,000	13%	15%	11%	15%	15%	15%	14%
Mean	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles	13,837 miles	13,823 miles	14,416 miles	14,169 miles
Median	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,799 miles
	(90%)	(86%)	(90%)	(90%)	(88%)	(90%)	(88%)

\*Among those who indicated any driving miles (continued on next page)

Table 2B (continued)

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total	2010 Total	2011 Total	2012 Total
<b>Residential location</b>							
City of Chicago	10%	12%	11%	13%	12%	10%	12%
Chicago suburbs	38%	37%	35%	39%	38%	38%	39%
Metro East	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%
City > 75,000	8%	8%	8%	7%	6%	7%	7%
City 20-75,000	10%	10%	11%	8%	10%	9%	10%
City/town 10-20,000	8%	8%	10%	8%	8%	8%	7%
Town < 10,000	13%	14%	12%	11%	12%	13%	9%
Rural	9%	10%	10%	11%	11%	12%	14%
	(96%)	(94%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>							
White						87%	85%
African-American						7%	7%
Hispanic						3%	3%
Asian						3%	4%
Other / multi						1%	1%
						(97%)	(97%)
<b>Commuting</b>							
% giving answer	53-54%	58%	51-52%	53%	55%	52-53%	60-61%
<i>Of these:</i>							
<i>avg miles one way to work</i>	Mean = 18.4 Med = 14.2	Mean = 18.2 Med = 14.0	Mean = 15.9** Med = 11.0	Mean = 16.4 Med = 12.0	Mean = 18.8** Med = 11.4	Mean = 18.0 Med = 12.0	Mean = 15.6 Med = 10.0
<i>avg minutes to work</i>	Mean = 30.2 Med = 25.0	Mean = 31.7 Med = 30.0	Mean = 28.2 Med = 20.0	Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0	Mean = 27.8 Med = 25.0	Mean = 29.4 Med = 25.0	Mean = 26.6 Med = 20.0
<i>avg minutes home from work</i>	Mean = 31.1 Med = 30.0	Mean = 35.7 Med = 30.0	Mean = 30.7 Med = 25.0	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 32.8 Med = 30.0	Mean = 29.5 Med = 20.4
<i>avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)</i>	Mean = 61.3 Med = 55.0	Mean = 67.4 Med = 60.0	Mean = 59.0 Med = 45.0	Mean = 59.3 Med = 50.0	Mean = 58.4 Med = 50.0	Mean = 62.2 Med = 55.0	Mean = 56.1 Med = 40.4

\*\*In the calculation of these 2008 means, a few outlier cases were excluded. In 2010, a few extreme cases here were set at 500 miles for the maximum. In 2011, a few extreme cases were set to missing since it was apparent the respondent was answering in annual terms.

**Table 2C: Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2009 to 2012,  
Comparing Total Group and Population-Weighted Characteristics**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>2009 Total (1016)</b>	<b>2010 Total (1140)</b>	<b>2011 Total (1058)</b>	<b>2012 Total (1078)</b>	<b>2009 Popul (1016)</b>	<b>2010 Popul (1140)</b>	<b>2011 Popul (1058)</b>	<b>2012 Popul (1078)</b>
<b>Cooperation rate</b>	29.6%	31.6%	29.0%	30.2%	29.6%	31.6%	29.0%	30.2%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	57%	50%	56%	51%	49%	48%	49%	48%
Female	43%	50%	43%	49%	51%	52%	51%	52%
	(99%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)
<b>Age</b>								
16 to 35	12%	15%	14%	14%	25%	23%	22%	22%
36 to 45	14%	12%	12%	12%	18%	17%	16%	16%
46 to 55	21%	21%	20%	20%	20%	19%	19%	19%
56 to 65	25%	23%	25%	26%	19%	20%	20%	20%
66 to 75	16%	18%	18%	16%	11%	12%	12%	13%
Over 75	12%	12%	11%	11%	8%	9%	10%	9%
Mean	55.8 yrs	55.3 yrs	55.7 yrs	55.6 yrs	48.8 yrs	50.5 yrs	51.4 yrs	51.8 yrs
Median	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	50.0 yrs	51.0 yrs	52.0 yrs	53.0 yrs
	(96%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(97%)	(95%)	(96%)
<b>Education</b>								
Up to HS	26%	27%	27%	26%	31%	31%	31%	29%
Post HS	35%	34%	33%	33%	37%	37%	36%	38%
4-yr college	38%	39%	40%	41%	32%	32%	33%	33%
	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)	(97%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)
<b>Income</b>								
< \$25,000	16%	16%	14%	16%	19%	17%	16%	18%
\$25-49,999	27%	25%	26%	23%	27%	26%	29%	24%
\$50-74,999	24%	23%	22%	23%	24%	23%	22%	22%
\$75-100,000	16%	18%	17%	18%	13%	17%	15%	16%
> \$100,000	17%	18%	20%	20%	16%	18%	18%	19%
	(83%)	(86%)	(86%)	(84%)	(83%)	(86%)	(87%)	(84%)
Up to \$49,999	43%	41%	41%	39%	47%	43%	45%	42%
\$50-74,999	24%	23%	22%	23%	24%	23%	22%	22%
\$75,000 and up	33%	36%	37%	38%	30%	35%	33%	36%
<b>Miles drive / yr</b>								
Up to 6,000*	26%	25%	22%	24%	28%	27%	25%	25%
6,000+ -12,000	34%	37%	37%	36%	33%	35%	35%	37%
12,000+ - 20,000	27%	23%	26%	26%	26%	24%	25%	24%
Over 20,000	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%	14%	15%	14%
Mean	13,837 miles	13,823 miles	14,416 miles	14,169 miles	13,738 miles	13,775 miles	14,249 miles	14,165 miles
Median	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,799 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,582 miles	10,000 miles
	(90%)	(88%)	(90%)	(88%)	(88%)	(86%)	(86%)	(86%)

\*Among those who indicated any driving miles (continued on next page)

Table 2C (continued)

Characteristic	2009 Total	2010 Total	2011 Total	2012 Total	2009 Popul	2010 Popul	2011 Popul	2012 Popul
<b>Residential location</b>								
City of Chicago	13%	12%	10%	12%	21%	21%	21%	21%
Chicago suburbs	39%	38%	38%	39%	36%	34%	34%	36%
Metro East	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
City > 75,000	7%	6%	7%	7%	5%	5%	5%	5%
City 20-75,000	8%	10%	9%	10%	7%	9%	8%	8%
City/town 10-20,000	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%	7%	8%	6%
Town < 10,000	11%	12%	13%	9%	11%	12%	11%	8%
Rural	11%	11%	12%	14%	9%	10%	10%	11%
	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>								
White			87%	85%			77%	76%
African-American			7%	7%			13%	13%
Hispanic			3%	3%			6%	7%
Asian			3%	4%			3%	3%
Other / multi			1%	1%			1%	1%
			(97%)	(97%)			(97%)	(97%)
<b>Commuting</b>								
% giving answer	53%	55%	52-53%	60-61%	57%	59%	52-53%	60-61%
Of these:								
avg miles one way to work	Mean = 16.4 Med = 12.0	Mean = 18.8** Med = 11.4	Mean = 18.0** Med = 12.0	Mean = 15.6 Med = 10.0	Mean = 16.3 Med = 12.0	Mean = 18.4** Med = 11.0	Mean = 17.0** Med = 12.0	Mean = 16.0 Med = 12.0
avg minutes to work	Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0	Mean = 27.8 Med = 25.0	Mean = 29.4 Med = 25.0	Mean = 26.6 Med = 20.0	Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0	Mean = 28.3 Med = 25.0	Mean = 28.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 27.5 Med = 20.0
avg minutes home from work	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 32.8 Med = 30.0	Mean = 29.5 Med = 20.4	Mean = 30.5 Med = 25.0	Mean = 31.5 Med = 30.0	Mean = 32.8 Med = 29.0	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0
avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)	Mean = 59.3 Med = 50.0	Mean = 58.4 Med = 50.0	Mean = 62.2 Med = 55.0	Mean = 56.1 Med = 40.4	Mean = 59.2 Med = 50.0	Mean = 59.8 Med = 55.0	Mean = 61.4 Med = 54.0	Mean = 58.1 Med = 45.0

\*\*In the calculation of these 2008 means, a few outlier cases were excluded. In 2010, a few extreme cases here were set at 500 miles for the maximum. In 2011, a few extreme cases were set to missing since it was apparent the respondent was answering in annual terms.

## A Summary of Results

A summary of the final results follows. As noted earlier, when summarizing results for questions that have appeared in earlier surveys, our focus is on the total group results for 2012, the analysis group which we believe is the best comparison to these earlier results. However, we also present the population-weighted results in the 2012 tables. *The focus on the total group results also appears relevant when reporting on questions with driving-related topics.* When summarizing results for the topical, general policy-related questions (the Amtrak and high-speed rail questions), our focus is on the population-weighted results, the analysis group which is more representative of the Illinois adult public as a whole. Throughout the summary, we do offer comments on the results for the other analysis group(s) not the focus of the respective section when this is warranted (including respondents who are licensed drivers in “listed” households for one section).

In tables reporting trends, we present results for the total sample for all previous surveys, with the exception of the 2002 survey. For the Spring 2002 survey results, we have included three averages: that for all respondents; that for the cross-sectional sample; and that for the panel sample. However, it is our opinion that the best comparison here is the with the 2002 “cross-sectional” sample (the middle result reported), and it is this figure we use when examining and commenting upon trends below.

### Questions continuing throughout the survey series

#### Ratings of specific aspects of highways and bridges

We asked respondents to rate nine aspects under the category of Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, ten aspects under the category of Road Repair and Construction (nine of which are continuing aspects for the whole survey series; one of which has appeared since the 2007 survey), and five aspects under the category of Traveler Services.

The 2012 results here fit into the overall consistency across the survey series that we have seen with regard to the order of aspects within each major category across the survey series. In the past, when differences in rank order from year-to-year have occurred (which is rare), they generally have occurred only for those aspects rated very similar to each other. The same holds true for the most recent results.

Changes from 2011 to 2012. The vast majority of the Spring 2012 mean ratings for these items are basically on par with their respective 2011 mean ratings, with 17 of the 24 items having a 2012 mean rating within +/- 0.04 of its 2011 mean. For those items which show greater changes in mean ratings than this from 2010 to 2011, “increases” (i.e., more favorable mean ratings) are far more common than are “decreases” (i.e., less favorable mean ratings), by 6 to 1. (See Summary Change Table 1, the right-most column. For comparison purposes, this table also includes a summary of year-to-year changes since the 2007 survey.)

The largest increases in mean ratings are found for four items, one under the general topic of Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow and three under the general topic of Road Repair and

Construction. The largest increase is found for an item in the latter topic, the flow of traffic through work zones, which shows an increase in its mean rating of +0.10 (3.03 to 3.13). The other three items are all items which relate to advising motorists of delays and/or construction activities:

*Signs about alternative routes when there is construction* (3.36 to 3.45, +0.09), under Road Repairs and Construction

*Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas* (3.84 to 3.92, +0.08), under Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow

*Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio and newspapers* (3.34 to 3.42, + 0.08), under Road Repairs and Construction

**Summary Change Table 1**  
**Changes in Mean Ratings for Items in Adjacent Surveys,**  
**Most Recent Five Surveys**

	Change <sup>a</sup>	2007 to 2008	2008 to 2009	2009 to 2010	2010 to 2011	2011 to 2012
	LAPSE	1-year	1-year	1-year	1-year	1-year
<b>Maintaining Highways &amp; Traffic Flow</b>	Increase	0	4	0	1	2
	Stable	5	4	7	8	7
	Decrease	4	1	2	0	0
<b>Road Repair &amp; Construction</b>	Increase	1	5	1	1	4
	Stable	4	5	6	8	6
	Decrease	5	0	3	1	0
<b>Traveler Services</b>	Increase	0	5	0	4	0
	Stable	4	0	0	1	4
	Decrease	1	0	5	0	1
<b>All Items</b>	Increase	1	14	1	6	6
	Stable	13	9	13	17	17
	Decrease	10	1	10	1	1

<sup>a</sup>Stable is defined as having mean ratings within +/- 0.04.

Longer range trends to present. Summary Change Table 2 shows the results of comparing the 2012 mean results to those of past surveys, going back six years. Again, the most recent 2011-to-2012 changes are in the right-most column and were summarized above.

Changes from 2010 to 2012 (two years). Only two of the mean ratings show declines from 2010 to 2012. The remaining 22 items are evenly divided between those which show increases and those which are stable.

Changes from 2009 to 2012 (three years). Fifteen (15) of the mean ratings show stability here, while the remaining nine show that decreases only slightly outnumber increases (5 to 4).

Changes from 2008 to 2012 (four years). Nearly 90 percent of the mean ratings (21 of 24) show increases in mean ratings from 2008 to 2012. The other 3 show stability.

Changes from 2007 to 2012 (five years). Fourteen (14) of the mean ratings are stable from 2007 to 2012. For the other ten, items showing increases vastly outnumber those showing decreases (9 to 1).

Changes from 2006 to 2012 (six years). Eleven (11) of the mean ratings are stable from 2007 to 2012. The other 12 items are evenly split between those showing increases and those showing decreases. (Note there were 23 items in 2006, not the 24 found in the 2007 through 2012 surveys).

**Summary Change Table 2**  
**Changes in Mean Ratings for Items for Selected Years through 2012**

	Change <sup>a</sup>	<i>2006 to 2012</i>	<i>2007 to 2012</i>	<i>2008 to 2012</i>	<i>2009 to 2012</i>	<i>2010 to 2012</i>	<i>2011 to 2012</i>
	<b>LAPSE</b>	<i>6-years</i>	<i>5-years</i>	<i>4-years</i>	<i>3-years</i>	<i>2-years</i>	<i>1-year</i>
<b>Maintaining Highways &amp; Traffic Flow</b>	Increase	2	1	6	2	5	2
	Stable	5	7	3	6	4	7
	Decrease	2	1	0	1	0	0
<b>Road Repair &amp; Construction</b>	Increase	1	5	10	2	4	4
	Stable	4	5	0	6	4	6
	Decrease	4	0	0	2	2	0
<b>Traveler Services</b>	Increase	3	3	5	0	2	0
	Stable	2	2	0	3	3	4
	Decrease	0	0	0	2	0	1
<b>All Items</b>	Increase	6	9	21	4	11	6
	Stable	11	14	3	15	11	17
	Decrease	6	1	0	5	2	1

<sup>a</sup>Stable is defined as having mean ratings within +/- 0.04. Note that there were 23 items in 2006, and 24 items in 2007 through 2012.

The results for the evaluation ratings of the items in the three major groupings identified above are presented in the next few sections. In these sections, the 2012 results are presented in both summary tables (mean scores and percentages for the two most positive categories) and detailed tables (full distributions across the response categories). Results are presented for both the total sample group (weighted only by district) and the population-weighted sample. In addition, the trend results are presented for mean scores in the ratings across the survey series,

using the “total sample group” means here. As noted earlier, our focus here is on the total group results because of their greater comparability to earlier surveys.

### **Maintaining highways and traffic flow**

Results are presented below (in Table 3) for both the total group results and the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an “excellent” rating, the percent giving an “excellent” or “good” rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 3A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 3B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 3B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

**Table 3**  
**Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: Summary Results**

<b>Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: 2012 Results<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Total Group</b>			<b>Population-wgtd</b>		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	<i>Mean</i>	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	<i>Mean</i>
<b><i>Tier One</i></b>						
1. Traffic signs (5)	22%	77%	3.94	24%	76%	3.95
2. Electronic message boards to advise of delays or construction areas (6)	22%	75%	3.92	24%	76%	3.94
<b><i>Tier Two</i></b>						
3. Snow and ice removal (4)	16%	69%	3.75	17%	68%	3.72
4. Visibility of lane / shoulder markings (7)	14%	64%	3.67	16%	66%	3.72
<b><i>Tier Three</i></b>						
5. Cleanliness of roadsides (1)	8%	57%	3.52	9%	57%	3.53
6. Landscaping and overall appearance (3)	9%	54%	3.48	10%	55%	3.51
<b><i>Tier Four</i></b>						
7. Roadside lighting and reflectors (9)	8%	50%	3.42	10%	52%	3.46
8. Timing of traffic signals (8)	8%	53%	3.41	9%	55%	3.43
9. Timely removal of debris and dead animals (2)	8%	52%	3.41	9%	52%	3.42

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

### ***The 2012 results***

Examining the 2012 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the nine aspects can be ordered into the following general four tiers. The following offers the rationale for these tiers, with the aspects themselves identified in the table above.

In the first tier are two aspects (ranked 1 and 2) which both receive “excellent” ratings from just over one in five respondents, and receive ratings of “excellent” or “good” by at least three-quarters of the respondents: traffic signs; and electronic message boards to advise of delays or construction areas.

**Table 3A**  
**Ratings on Aspects relating to Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow**

<b>Aspect rated<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Excellent (5)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Fair (3)</b>	<b>Poor (2)</b>	<b>Very Poor (1)</b>	<b><i>unwgt'd n (% of sample)</i></b>	<b><i>mean</i></b>
1. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, miles to destination signs) (5)	22% (24%)	55% (52%)	20% (20%)	3% (2%)	1% (1%)	1054 (98%)	3.94 (3.95)
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (6)	22% (24%)	53% (51%)	21% (20%)	2% (2%)	2% (2%)	1013 (94%)	3.92 (3.94)
3. Snow and ice removal (4)	16% (17%)	53% (52%)	23% (22%)	6% (7%)	2% (3%)	1047 (97%)	3.75 (3.72)
4. Visibility of lane and shoulder markings on highways (7)	14% (16%)	50% (49%)	28% (26%)	6% (6%)	2% (2%)	1050 (99%)	3.67 (3.72)
5. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (1)	8% (9%)	49% (48%)	32% (32%)	9% (9%)	2% (2%)	1052 (98%)	3.52 (3.53)
6. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (3)	9% (10%)	46% (46%)	33% (33%)	10% (10%)	2% (2%)	1051 (98%)	3.48 (3.51)
7. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visibility after dark and in bad weather (9)	8% (10%)	42% (42%)	36% (35%)	11% (10%)	3% (3%)	1020 (96%)	3.42 (3.46)
8. Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (8)	8% (9%)	45% (45%)	31% (30%)	11% (12%)	4% (4%)	1027 (95%)	3.41 (3.43)
9. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement (2)	8% (9%)	44% (43%)	33% (34%)	11% (11%)	4% (4%)	1009 (94%)	3.41 (3.42)

<sup>a</sup> Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age, education level and race/ethnicity). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

<sup>b</sup> The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

In the second tier are two aspects (ranked 3 and 4) which receive “excellent” ratings by 14 to 16 percent of the respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by 64 to 69 percent of the respondents (i.e., somewhat less than or slightly more than two-thirds): visibility of lane/shoulder markings; and snow and ice removal.

In the third tier are two aspects (ranked 5 and 6) which receive “excellent” ratings by 8 to 9 percent of the respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by over half of the respondents (54 to 57%): cleanliness of roadsides; and landscaping and overall appearance.

And, in the fourth tier are three aspects (ranked 7 through 9) which receive “excellent” ratings by 8 percent of the respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by half of the respondents or slightly more (50-53%): roadside lighting and reflectors; timing of traffic signals; and timely removal of debris and dead animals.

See Table 3B for the full distribution of results for 2012, provided both for the “total” analysis group and for the population-weighted analysis group.

### ***Changes from earlier surveys***

Rankings and tiers. Overall, the order of the nine items has remained very similar across the survey series. Not surprisingly then, with regard to the most recent two surveys, the 2012 order of the specific aspects is extremely similar to that in 2011, with only a couple very modest to minor changes.

One change is that the mean score for the item of “landscaping and overall appearance” became more similar to the item ahead of it rather than those behind it, thus jumping this item from Tier Four to Tier Three. The other change occurred in the relative positions of items in Tier Four, really a minor change where “timely removal of debris and dead animals” dropped from seventh to ninth (last), just slightly behind the other two items rather than just slightly ahead of them.

Mean ratings. *When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2011 (last year),* we find a great deal of stability – with seven of the nine items having a 2012 mean score that falls within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2011 mean score (five slight increases; two slight decreases). For the two exceptions, we find increases in the mean scores from 2011 to 2012:

The largest increase, for electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (+0.08, 3.84 to 3.92)

A smaller increase for snow and ice removal (+0.05, 3.70 to 3.75)

*When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2010 (two years ago),* we find that five of the nine items show increases, while the other four show stability. None show decreases. The largest increases are found for:

Snow and ice removal (+0.08, 3.67 to 3.75)

Traffic signs (+0.07, 3.87 to 3.94)

Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (+0.07, 3.85 to 3.92)

Landscaping and overall appearance (+0.06, 3.42 to 3.48)

Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (+0.05, 3.36 to 3.41)

When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2009 (three years ago), six of the nine are found to be stable, while two show an increase and one shows a decrease.

The largest increases are found for:

Snow and ice removal (+0.12, 3.63 to 3.75)

Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (+0.08, 3.84 to 3.92)

The decrease is found for:

Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (-0.06, 3.58 to 3.52)

And, when comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2007 (five years ago), seven of the nine are found to be stable, while one shows an increase and one shows a decrease.

The largest increase is found for: electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (+0.05, 3.87 to 3.92)

The largest decrease is found for: landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (-0.06, 3.54 to 3.48)

**Table Trend Summary 3**  
**Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, 2001 through 2012**  
(based on recent "Total Group" results)

Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow	Range	Outlier (if any)	Range excluding Outlier	2012 result - and comments
1. Traffic signs (5)	3.86-3.94			Tie for high (3.94)
2. Electronic message boards to advise of delays or construction areas (6)	3.70–3.92			Highest (3.92)
<b>Tier Two</b>				
3. Snow and ice removal (4)	3.63-3.96			(3.75)
4. Visibility of lane / shoulder markings (7)	3.57-3.69			In top five (3.67)
<b>Tier Three</b>				
5. Cleanliness of roadsides (1)	3.36-3.58	3.36 (2001)	3.45-3.58	(3.52)
6. Landscaping and overall appearance (3)	3.39-3.54			(3.48)
<b>Tier Four</b>				
7. Roadside lighting and reflectors (9)	3.33-3.42	3.33 (2001)	3.39-3.42	Highest (3.42)
8. Timing of traffic signals (8)	3.33-3.44			In top five (3.41)
9. Timely removal of debris and dead animals (2)	3.41-3.56			Tie for low (3.41)

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

### ***The 2012 results in the context of the survey series***

A summary of the 2012 results in the context of the entire 2001-through-2012 survey series is presented in Table Trend Summary 3 (previous page). This table presents: the items, in order of the 2012 results; the range of the mean scores for the item over the survey series; any outlier that is present in this range; the range of mean scores, excluding the outlier; and the 2012 mean score result, along with any applicable comments regarding the 2012 mean in the context of the entire survey series.

This summary reveals that the 2012 mean ratings are the most positive (“highest”) or tied for the most positive for three of the nine items:

1. Traffic signs
2. Electronic messages boards to advise of delays or construction areas
7. Roadside lighting and reflectors

In addition, the 2012 mean ratings are in the top five for another two items:

4. Visibility of lane / shoulder markings
8. timing of traffic signals

And, the 2012 mean rating is tied for the least positive (“lowest”) of the survey series for one item:

9. Timely removal of debris and dead animals

**Table 3B**  
**Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: Trends Across Surveys**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Sum- mer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 “Total” means (n)</b>
1. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, miles to destination signs) (5)	3.86 (1379)	3.89 (1236)	3.92 3.93 3.90	3.90 (1399)	3.94 (1307)	3.91 (1310)	3.91 (1304)	3.90 (1386)	3.88 (1291)	3.91 (1000)	3.87 (1111)	3.92 (1043)	3.94 (1054)
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (6)	3.70 (1323)	3.81 (1199)	3.79 3.75 3.82	3.70 (1322)	3.79 (1234)	3.80 (1244)	3.87 (1241)	3.87 (1342)	3.83 (1240)	3.84 (957)	3.85 (1080)	3.84 (1009)	3.92 (1013)
3. Snow and ice removal (4)	3.82 (1363)	3.72 (1222)	3.93 3.89 3.99	3.95 (1400)	3.96 (1302)	3.91 (1326)	3.86 (1300)	3.75 (1362)	3.70 (1271)	3.63 (988)	3.67 (1094)	3.70 (1031)	3.75 (1047)
4. Visibility of lane and shoulder markings on highways (7)	3.57 (1372)	3.69 (1229)	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.61 (1399)	3.68 (1308)	3.59 (1305)	3.61 (1303)	3.64 (1383)	3.65 (1284)	3.66 (997)	3.67 (1109)	3.63 (1045)	3.67 (1050)
5. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (1)	3.36 (1384)	3.56 (1242)	3.50 3.45 3.55	3.52 (1407)	3.47 (1314)	3.52 (1297)	3.52 (1308)	3.54 (1391)	3.45 (1281)	3.58 (990)	3.54 (1118)	3.56 (1045)	3.52 (1052)
6. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (3)	3.43 (1377)	3.52 (1231)	3.53 3.48 3.58	3.53 (1399)	3.52 (1305)	3.54 (1301)	3.49 (1303)	3.54 (1387)	3.39 (1283)	3.51 (991)	3.42 (1110)	3.46 (1033)	3.48 (1051)

(continued on next page)

**Table 3B. (continued)**

**Ratings on Aspects relating to Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Sum- mer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 “Total” means (n)</b>
7. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visi-bility after dark and in bad weather (9)	3.33 (1352)	3.41 (1203)	3.44 3.42 3.46	3.39 (1363)	3.43 (1291)	3.39 (1273)	3.41 (1277)	3.41 (1359)	3.40 (1260)	3.41 (977)	3.40 (1103)	3.41 (1018)	3.42 (1020)
8. Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (8)	3.33 (1347)	3.37 (1212)	3.44 3.41 3.48	3.42 (1387)	3.44 (1291)	3.35 (1283)	3.40 (1273)	3.38 (1347)	3.35 (1245)	3.42 (974)	3.36 (1093)	3.39 (1013)	3.41 (1027)
9. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement (2)	3.43 (1342)	3.46 (1207)	3.50 3.46 3.54	3.56 (1363)	3.50 (1277)	3.51 (1267)	3.50 (1252)	3.44 (1341)	3.37 (1243)	3.44 (959)	3.41 (1076)	3.42 (1003)	3.41 (1009)

## Road repair and construction

Results are presented below (in Table 4) for both the total group results and for the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an “excellent” rating, the percent giving an “excellent” or “good” rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 4A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 4B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 4B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

**Table 4**  
**Road Repair and Construction: Summary Results**

Road Repair and Construction: 2012 Results <sup>a</sup>	Total Group			Population-wgtd		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean
<b><i>Tier One</i></b>						
1. Warning signs when workers are are present (7)	20%	78%	3.93	21%	77%	3.93
<b><i>Tier Two</i></b>						
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	12%	64%	3.66	12%	63%	3.64
3. Advance information about future construction projects through informa- tional highway signs (10)	11%	59%	3.59	13%	60%	3.61
<b><i>Tier Three</i></b>						
4. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	11%	52%	3.45	11%	53%	3.46
5. Advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers and Internet (9)	10%	52%	3.42	11%	53%	3.44
<b><i>Tier Four</i></b>						
6. Ride quality / smoothness on interstates (3)	4%	41%	3.20	5%	44%	3.24
<b><i>Tier Five</i></b>						
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	3%	36%	3.13	4%	35%	3.09
8. Ride quality / smoothness on non-interstates (4)	3%	34%	3.05	3%	35%	3.07
9. Timeliness of repairs on interstates (1)	3%	33%	3.04	3%	33%	3.04
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstates (2)	2%	29%	2.98	2%	31%	3.01

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

## ***The 2012 results***

Examining the 2012 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the ten aspects can be ordered into the following general five tiers. The following offers the rationale for these tiers, with the aspects themselves identified in the table above.

In the first tier is one aspect (ranked 1) which receives “excellent” ratings from one in five respondents, and receives ratings of “excellent” or “good” by over three-quarters of the respondents: warning signs when workers are present.

In the second tier are two aspects (ranked 2 and 3) which receive “excellent” ratings by over one in ten respondents (11-12%) and “excellent” or “good” ratings by about six in ten respondents (59-64%): work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed; and advance information about future construction projects through informational highway signs.

In the third tier are two aspects (ranked 4 and 5) which receive “excellent” ratings by about one in ten respondents (10-11%) and “excellent” or “good” ratings by slightly more than half of the respondents (52%): signs about alternative routes when there is construction; advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers and the Internet.

In the fourth tier is one aspect (ranked 6) which receives “excellent” ratings by 4 percent of the respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by just over four in ten (41%): ride quality/smoothness on interstates.

In the fifth tier are four aspects (ranked 7 through 10) which receive “excellent” ratings by fewer than one in twenty respondents (2-3%) and “excellent” or “good” ratings by proportions ranging from 29 percent to 36 percent: the flow of traffic through work zones; ride quality/smoothness of non-interstates; timeliness of repairs on interstates; and timeliness of repairs on non-interstates.

## ***Changes from earlier surveys***

Rankings and tiers. Overall, the order of the items within this section has remained very similar across the survey series. Most recently, the 2012 order of the specific aspects differs from the 2011 order with only one change, with “the flow of traffic through work zones” increasing from the #8 position in 2011 to the #7 position in 2012, now at the top of Tier Five.

Mean ratings. *When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2011 (last year),* we find six items which have a 2012 mean rating within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2011 mean (four slight increases and two slight decreases). Increases are found for the other four items.

The largest increases found for:

- the flow of traffic through work zones (+0.10, 3.03 to 3.13)
- signs about alternative routes when there is construction (+0.09, 3.36 to 3.45)
- advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio and newspapers (+0.08, 3.34 to 3.42)

A smaller increase is found for warning signs when workers are present (+0.05, 3.88 to 3.93).

*When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2010 (two years ago), we find four items which are within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2010 mean. Another four show increases. Two show decreases.*

The increases are found for:

- Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (+0.10, 3.35 to 3.45)
- The flow of traffic through work zones (+0.10, 3.03 to 3.13)
- Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (+0.09, 3.55 to 3.66)
- Warning signs when workers are present (+0.08, 3.85 to 3.93)

The decreases are found for:

- Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on non-interstate highways (-0.08, 3.13 to 3.05)
- Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (-0.05, 3.25 to 3.20)

*When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2009 (three years ago), we find six items which are within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2009 mean. The other four items are evenly split between those where we find an increase and a decrease.*

The increases are found for:

- Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (+0.12, 3.33 to 3.45)
- Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (+0.06, 3.53 to 3.59)

The decreases are found for:

- Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on non-interstate highways (-0.05, 3.25 to 3.05)
- Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (-0.05, 3.09 to 3.04)

*And, when comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2007 (five years ago), we find five items which are within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2009 mean. Five items show increases. None shows a decrease.*

The largest increase is found for:

- Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (+0.13, 3.46 to 3.59)

Smaller increases are found for:

- Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (+0.06, 3.39 to 3.45)
- The flow of traffic through work zones (+0.06, 3.07 to 3.13)
- Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (+0.06, 2.92 to 2.98)
- Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (+0.05, 3.61 to 3.66)

### ***The 2012 results in the context of the survey series***

A summary of the 2012 results in the context of the entire 2001-through-2012 survey series is presented in Table Trend Summary 4. This table presents: the items, in order of the 2012 results; the range of the mean scores for each item over the survey series; any outlier that is present in this range; the range of mean scores, excluding the outlier; and the 2012 mean score result, along with any applicable comments regarding the 2012 mean in the context of the entire survey series.

**Table Trend Summary 4**  
**Road Repair and Construction, 2001 through 2012**  
 (based on recent "Total Group" results)

<b>Road Repair and Construction</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Outlier (if any)</b>	<b>Range excluding Outlier</b>	<b>2012 result - and comments</b>
<b><i>Tier One</i></b>				
1. Warning signs when workers are are present (7)	3.79-3.93			Highest (3.93)
<b><i>Tier Two</i></b>				
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	3.55-3.67			2 <sup>nd</sup> highest (3.66)
3. Advance information about future construction projects through informational highway signs (10)	3.46-3.59			Highest (3.59)
<b><i>Tier Three</i></b>				
4. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	3.25-3.45			Highest (3.45)
5. Advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers and Internet (9)	3.34-3.57	3.57 (2006)	3.34-3.43	Toward top of range, excl outlier (3.42)
<b><i>Tier Four</i></b>				
6. Ride quality / smoothness on interstates (3)	3.08-3.29			(3.20)
<b><i>Tier Five</i></b>				
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	2.95-3.13			Highest (3.13)
8. Ride quality / smoothness on non-interstates (4)	2.89-3.13			(3.05)
9. Timeliness of repairs on interstates (1)	2.96-3.17			(3.04)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstates (2)	2.84-3.08			(2.98)

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

This summary reveals that the 2012 mean ratings are the most positive (“highest”) or tied for the most positive for four of the ten items:

1. Warning signs when workers are present
3. Advance information about future construction projects through informational highway signs
4. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction
7. The flow of traffic through work zones

In addition, the 2012 mean rating for the following is 2<sup>nd</sup> most positive:

2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed

And, the 2012 mean rating for the following is toward the top of its range, if the one most positive outlier is excluded:

5. Advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers and internet

**Table 4A**  
**Ratings on Aspects relating to**  
**Road Repair and Construction**

<b>Aspect rated<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Excellent (5)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Fair (3)</b>	<b>Poor (2)</b>	<b>Very Poor (1)</b>	<b><i>unwgt'd n (% of sample)</i></b>	<b><i>mean</i></b>
1. Warning signs when workers are present (7)	20% (21%)	57% (56%)	18% (19%)	3% (3%)	1% (2%)	1047 (97%)	3.93 (3.93)
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	12% (12%)	52% (51%)	28% (29%)	6% (6%)	2% (2%)	1053 (98%)	3.66 (3.64)
3. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (10)**	11% (13%)	48% (46%)	32% (30%)	7% (8%)	2% (2%)	996 (92%)	3.59 (3.61)
4. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	11% (11%)	42% (42%)	33% (31%)	12% (12%)	3% (3%)	1021 (95%)	3.45 (3.46)
5. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio, and newspapers (9)	10% (11%)	43% (42%)	33% (30%)	12% (13%)	3% (4%)	1021 (95%)	3.42 (3.44)
6. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (3)	4% (5%)	37% (39%)	39% (38%)	14% (12%)	6% (6%)	1040 (96%)	3.20 (3.24)
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	3% (4%)	33% (31%)	43% (43%)	16% (17%)	5% (6%)	1047 (97%)	3.13 (3.09)
8. Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways (4)	3% (3%)	31% (32%)	42% (42%)	17% (16%)	7% (7%)	1039 (96%)	3.05 (3.07)
9. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (1)	3% (3%)	30% (30%)	42% (41%)	18% (18%)	7% (7%)	988 (92%)	3.04 (3.04)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (2)	2% (2%)	27% (28%)	45% (44%)	19% (18%)	7% (7%)	997 (92%)	2.98 (3.01)

<sup>a</sup>Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age, education level and race/ethnicity). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

<sup>b</sup>The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

**Table 4B**  
**Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Road Repair and Construction: Trends Across Surveys**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Summer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 “Total” means (n)</b>
1. Warning signs when workers are present (7)	3.81 (1374)	3.89 (1233)	3.82 3.79 3.86	3.89 (1402)	3.86 (1302)	3.89 (1299)	3.92 (1299)	3.91 (1383)	3.88 (1284)	3.92 (999)	3.85 (1107)	3.88 (1040)	3.93 (1047)
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	3.71 (1378)	3.58 (1231)	3.65 3.63 3.67	3.60 (1392)	3.62 (1302)	3.61 (1300)	3.65 (1300)	3.61 (1381)	3.61 (1280)	3.67 (993)	3.55 (1112)	3.63 (1031)	3.66 (1053)
3. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (10)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3.46 (1314)	3.51 (1214)	3.53 (939)	3.55 (1045)	3.55 (982)	3.59 (996)
4. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	3.25 (1328)	3.32 (1200)	3.24 3.23 3.26	3.29 (1373)	3.34 (1260)	3.32 (1261)	3.35 (1267)	3.39 (1344)	3.34 (1252)	3.33 (971)	3.35 (1082)	3.36 (1015)	3.45 (1021)
5. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio, and newspapers (9)	3.41 (1294)	3.39 (1162)	3.40 3.36 3.45	3.42 (1309)	3.42 (1211)	3.36 (1196)	3.57 (1217)	3.43 (1299)	3.36 (1191)	3.38 (921)	3.38 (1031)	3.34 (947)	3.42 (1021)

(continued on next page)

**Table 4B. (continued)**

**Ratings on Aspects relating to Road Repair and Construction: Trends Across Surveys**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Sum- mer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 “Total” means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 “Total” means (n)</b>
6. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (3)	3.08 (1358)	3.26 (1207)	3.28 3.27 3.30	3.29 (1380)	3.28 (1289)	3.22 (1287)	3.28 (1275)	3.22 (1363)	3.10 (1260)	3.25 (966)	3.25 (1093)	3.24 (1021)	3.20 (1040)
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	2.95 (1372)	2.98 (1221)	3.11 3.05 3.17	3.09 (1378)	3.09 (1299)	3.06 (1279)	3.11 (1278)	3.07 (1374)	3.06 (1270)	3.09 (978)	3.03 (1102)	3.03 (1029)	3.13 (1047)
8. Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways (4)	2.89 (1342)	3.10 (1188)	3.12 3.10 3.14	3.13 (1369)	3.09 (1272)	3.07 (1265)	3.08 (1256)	3.02 (1337)	2.90 (1253)	3.08 (965)	3.13 (1087)	3.08 (1003)	3.05 (1039)
9. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (1)	2.97 (1322)	3.07 (1171)	3.16 3.12 3.22	3.17 (1337)	3.14 (1227)	3.08 (1238)	3.10 (1225)	3.00 (1316)	2.96 (1218)	3.09 (932)	3.06 (1055)	3.02 (990)	3.04 (988)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (2)	2.87 (1305)	3.00 (1132)	3.09 3.04 3.15	3.08 (1318)	3.04 (1216)	3.03 (1229)	3.00 (1209)	2.92 (1291)	2.84 (1207)	2.98 (919)	2.97 (1053)	2.96 (982)	2.98 (997)

## Traveler services

Results are presented below (in Table 5) for both the total group results and for the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an “excellent” rating, the percent giving an “excellent” or “good” rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 5A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 5B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 5B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

**Table 5**  
**Traveler Services: Summary Results**

Traveler Services: 2012 Results <sup>a</sup>	Total Group			Population-wgtd		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean
<b><i>Tier One</i></b>						
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging (3)	23%	83%	4.04	24%	83%	4.05
<b><i>Tier Two</i></b>						
2. Informational signs about tourist attractions and state parks (4)	18%	75%	3.89	19%	73%	3.88
<b><i>Tier Three</i></b>						
3. Cleanliness of rest areas (1)	14%	72%	3.78	14%	72%	3.78
4. Safety of rest areas (2)	12%	69%	3.75	13%	69%	3.76
<b><i>Tier Four</i></b>						
5. Availability of free IDOT maps (5)	17%	59%	3.55	17%	57%	3.53

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

## The 2012 results

Examining the 2012 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the five aspects can be ordered into the following four tiers.

In Tier One and Tier Two are the two items that relate to informational signs, with “signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging” receiving somewhat more favorable ratings than did “signs about tourist attractions and state parks.” The former received “excellent” ratings from nearly one in four of the respondents (23%) compared to about one in six respondents (18%) for the latter. And, just over eight in ten respondents gave either “excellent” or “good” ratings to the former compared to three-quarters for the latter.

Next, in Tier Three, are the two items relating to characteristics of rest areas, with “cleanliness” receiving just slightly more favorable ratings than did “safety.” For these

items, about one in seven/eight gave an “excellent” rating while about seven in ten gave “excellent” or “good” ratings.

In Tier Four, and in fifth position, is “availability of free IDOT maps,” which still received “excellent” or “good” ratings from nearly six in ten respondents. About one in six (17%) gave this item an “excellent” rating (actually somewhat more than was the case for the Tier Four items).

**Table 5A**  
**Ratings on Aspects relating to Traveler Services**

<b>Aspect rated<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Excellent (5)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Fair (3)</b>	<b>Poor (2)</b>	<b>Very Poor (1)</b>	<b><i>unwgt'd n (% of sample)</i></b>	<b><i>mean</i></b>
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, and lodging (3)	23% (24%)	61% (58%)	15% (15%)	2% (2%)	0+% (0+%)	1007 (93%)	4.04 (4.05)
2. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (4)	18% (19%)	57% (54%)	22% (24%)	3% (3%)	0+% (1%)	993 (92%)	3.89 (3.88)
3. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (1)	14% (14%)	58% (58%)	23% (23%)	4% (4%)	2% (2%)	862 (80%)	3.78 (3.78)
4. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (2)	12% (13%)	57% (56%)	25% (26%)	4% (3%)	2% (2%)	823 (76%)	3.75 (3.76)
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps (5)	17% (17%)	42% (40%)	25% (27%)	12% (11%)	5% (5%)	685 (64%)	3.55 (3.53)

<sup>a</sup>Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age, education level and race/ethnicity). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

<sup>b</sup>The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

### ***Changes from earlier surveys***

Rankings and tiers. The rank order of these aspects in 2012 accords with that in virtually every previous survey.<sup>16</sup> And, there is no change in the order or Tiers from 2011 to 2012.

Mean ratings. *When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2011 (last year),* we find four items to be within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2011 mean (one slight increase, two slight decreases, and one even). One item shows a decline. None shows an increase.

The decrease is for safety of rest areas for highways motorists (-0.05, 3.80 to 3.75)

*When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2010 (two years ago),* we find that three of the five items are stable, while the other two show increases. None show decreases. The increases are found for:

The largest, availability of free IDOT road maps (+0.11, 3.44 to 3.55), and  
Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (+0.06, 3.83 to 3.89)

*When comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2009 (three years ago),* we find that three of the five items are stable, while the other two show decreases. None show increases. The decreases are found for:

Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (-0.06, 3.84 to 3.78)  
Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (-0.05, 3.94 to 3.89)

*And, when comparing 2012 mean ratings to those in 2007 (five years ago),* three of the five items show increases. Two are stable. None shows a decrease.

The largest increase is found for availability of free IDOT road maps (+0.16, 3.39 to 3.55).

Other increases are found for:

Informational signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (+0.05, 3.84 to 3.89)  
Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (+0.05, 3.70 to 3.75)

### ***The 2012 results in the context of the survey series***

A summary of the 2012 results in the context of the entire 2001-through-2012 survey series is presented in Table Trend Summary 5. This table presents: the items, in order of the 2012 results; the range of the mean scores for each item over the survey series; any outlier that is present in this range; the range of mean scores, excluding the outlier; and the 2012 mean score result, along with any applicable comments regarding the 2012 mean in the context of the entire survey series.

---

<sup>16</sup> Note that, in the 2008 survey, the mean rating for “cleanliness of rest areas” was virtually tied with that of “safety of rest areas” rather than being slightly to somewhat more positive, which has been the case in all other surveys. Also, the Spring 2002 survey shows a slight departure in the order for the earlier nine surveys, and this is dependent upon which sample is examined.

This summary reveals that one 2012 mean rating is tied for the most positive (“highest”):

1. Availability of free IDOT maps (tied with the 2011 mean rating)

In addition, the 2012 mean rating for the following is in the top three:

2. Safety of rest areas

**Table Trend Summary 5**  
**Traveler Services, 2001 through 2012**  
(based on recent “Total Group” results)

Traveler Services	Range	Outlier (if any)	Range excluding Outlier	2012 result - and comments
<b><i>Tier One</i></b>				
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging (3)	3.99-4.07			(4.04)
<b><i>Tier Two</i></b>				
2. Informational signs about tourist attractions and state parks (4)	3.83-3.94			(3.89)
<b><i>Tier Three</i></b>				
3. Cleanliness of rest areas (1)	3.69-3.85			(3.78)
4. Safety of rest areas (2)	3.58-3.80			In top three (3.75)
5. Availability of free IDOT maps (5).	3.25-3.55	3.24 (2001)	3.34-3.55	Tie for high, with 2011 (3.55)

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

**Table 5B**  
**Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Traveler Services:**  
**Trends Across Surveys**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Sum- mer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 "Total" means (n)</b>
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, and lodging (3)	4.02 (1343)	4.07 (1191)	4.08 4.04 4.13	4.05 (1350)	4.07 (1265)	4.06 (1266)	4.02 (1254)	4.03 (1331)	3.99 (1217)	4.08 (943)	4.02 (1085)	4.03 (1019)	4.04 (1007)
2. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (4)	3.83 (1303)	3.89 (1159)	3.88 3.83 3.93	3.86 (1320)	3.86 (1223)	3.87 (1240)	3.84 (1219)	3.84 (1300)	3.83 (1181)	3.94 (904)	3.83 (1049)	3.90 (994)	3.89 (993)
3. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (1)	3.71 (1165)	3.77 (1035)	3.87 3.85 3.89	3.79 (1168)	3.78 (1095)	3.80 (1096)	3.74 (1052)	3.77 (1122)	3.69 (1031)	3.84 (802)	3.74 (909)	3.81 (859)	3.78 (862)
4. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (2)	3.58 (1100)	3.67 (983)	3.71 3.70 3.72	3.72 (1118)	3.72 (1021)	3.74 (1037)	3.68 (994)	3.70 (1067)	3.69 (976)	3.78 (762)	3.71 (865)	3.80 (813)	3.75 (823)
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps (5)	3.24 (947)	3.34 (847)	3.40 3.35 3.46	3.35 (991)	3.42 (891)	3.42 (908)	3.39 (871)	3.39 (951)	3.40 (836)	3.53 (637)	3.44 (746)	3.55 (704)	3.55 (685)

## **Average composite ratings for each general area**

For each of the three general areas, we calculated an average composite rating. In earlier survey years, we based the composite rating for the Road Repair and Construction section on the nine items that are consistent across all survey years. However, in 2012 as well as in 2011, we used all ten items for the composite rating in this area.

### ***The 2012 results***

In 2012, the composite mean ratings for all three general areas fall between the alternatives of “good” (when coded as 4) and “fair” (when coded as 3) – with the composite mean for Traveler Services being very much toward the “good” end of this range, the composite mean for Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow being only slightly/somewhat toward the “good” end of this range, and the composite mean for Road Repair and Construction somewhat toward the “fair” end of this range. For the composite median ratings, the same is true for two of the sections, but the median for the Traveler Services section is at the “good” rating point.

For the total group results in 2012, the most positive average scores are found for Traveler Services (mean = 3.84; median = 4.00) followed by the averages for Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow (mean = 3.61; median = 3.67) and then Road Repair and Construction (mean = 3.35; median = 3.40). [See Table 6A (includes standard deviations and n’s), Table 6B (trend data in a form more consistent with other tables), and Table 6C (summarizes survey-to-survey changes).] For the population-weighted results, the average ratings (both for means and medians) are either the same or just slightly more positive than for the total group results.

### ***Trends in the survey series***

*For the composite ratings on items within the area of Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow,* we generally find a high degree of consistency in average scores across the survey series, with ten of the thirteen mean scores falling in the range of 3.59 to 3.63. The most recent 2012 composite mean score (3.61) falls in the middle of this small range. The three surveys outside of this range, all with lower mean scores, are those of 2010 (3.57), 2008 (3.56), and the first survey of Spring 2001 (3.54). Across the survey time span, the median composite rating has been 3.67 in every year, with the exception of the first survey of Spring 2001 (median = 3.56).

*For the composite ratings on items within the area of Road Repair and Construction,* we find that nine of the thirteen surveys have mean composite ratings in the range of 3.29 to 3.33.<sup>17</sup> And, for all these nine surveys, the median composite rating is 3.33. Two surveys, the most recent 2012 survey (mean = 3.35; median = 3.40) and the 2006 survey (mean = 3.36; median = 3.42) have higher mean composite scores. And two surveys have lower mean composite scores, the 2008 survey (mean = 3.27; median = 3.30) and the first 2001 survey (mean = 3.22; median = 3.22).

---

<sup>17</sup> In calculating the composite score for 2007 through 2010, only the 9 continuing items were used. All 10 items were used in calculating the 2011 and 2012 composite scores.

For the composite ratings on items within the area of Traveler Services, we find that eight of the first nine surveys have means ranging from 3.74 to 3.79 (with the first survey having a lower mean score of 3.71). But here, only one of the most recent four surveys has a mean in this range (2010). Three of the most recent surveys have higher mean scores, in the 3.83 to 3.85 range. The 2012 survey mean is in the middle of this higher range. Median composite scores are 3.80 or 4.00 across the entire series, with the most recent four surveys having the latter.

**Table 6A**  
**Summary Statistics for Composite Section Ratings**

For each of the above three sections, a composite rating was derived by calculating the average score across the items in the section. This was done by summing all relevant ratings and dividing by the total number of items rated in the respective section. For reports prior to 2011, the composite rating for the Road Repair and Construction section is based on the nine items that are consistent across all survey years. It is based on all ten items in 2011.

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std dev</b>	<b>n</b>
<b>Spring, 2012</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.67 (3.67)	3.61 (3.63)	0.59 (0.61)	1062
<i>Road repair and construction (1-10)</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.40 (3.40)	3.35 (3.36)	0.65 (0.67)	1054
<i>Traveler services</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	4.00 (4.00)	3.84 (3.84)	0.62 (0.63)	1000
<b>Fall, 2011</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.67 (3.67)	3.59 (3.60)	0.63 (0.64)	1049
<i>Road repair and construction (1-10)</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.33 (3.33)	3.32 (3.33)	0.70 (0.71)	1038
<i>Traveler services</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	4.00 (4.00)	3.83 (3.83)	0.69 (0.68)	1013
<b>Fall, 2010</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.67 (3.62)	3.57 (3.55)	0.59 (0.61)	1139
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.33 (3.33)	3.28 (3.28)	0.66 (0.67)	1137
<i>Traveler services</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	4.00 (4.00)	3.77 (3.74)	0.68 (0.71)	1106
<b>Fall, 2009</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.67 (3.67)	3.60 (3.58)	0.59 (0.59)	1007
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	3.33 (3.33)	3.32 (3.29)	0.63 (0.64)	1009
<i>Traveler services</i> (population-wgtd in parentheses)	4.00 (4.00)	3.85 (3.82)	0.63 (0.63)	958
<b>Summer, 2008</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.56	0.57	1296
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i>	3.30	3.27	0.64	1298
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.74	0.68	1241

(continued on next page)

**Table 6A**  
**Summary Statistics for Composite Section Ratings**

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std dev</b>	<b>n</b>
<b>Spring, 2007</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.61	0.57	1402
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i>	3.33	3.30	0.65	1397
<i>Traveler services</i>	4.00	3.77	0.67	1352
<b>Spring, 2006</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.62	0.57	1318
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.42	3.36	0.62	1315
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.75	0.64	1271
<b>Spring, 2005</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.61	0.56	1315
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.30	0.64	1311
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.79	0.62	1278
<b>Spring, 2004</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.63	0.53	1320
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33	0.61	1318
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.78	0.65	1280
<b>Spring, 2003</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.62	0.53	1418
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33	0.59	1416
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.77	0.63	1370
<b>Spring, 2002</b> <i>Top number: total</i> <i>Middle number: cross-sectional</i> <i>Bottom number: panel</i>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.63*	0.54	1760
	3.67	3.61	0.54	964
	3.67	3.67	0.53	796
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33*	0.60	1753
	3.33	3.30	0.59	959
	3.38	3.36	0.61	795
<i>Traveler services</i>	4.00	3.80*	0.60	1680
	3.80	3.77	0.61	900
	4.00	3.84	0.60	780
<b>Fall, 2001</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.60	0.53	1245
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.29	0.62	1243
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.77	0.63	1205
<b>Spring, 2001</b>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.56	3.54	0.57	1391
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.22	0.60	1389
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.71	0.65	1359

\*indicates the difference between the two Spring 2002 samples is significant at the .01 level.

**Table 6B**  
**Average Composite Rating Scores**  
**Across Surveys**

Rating Area	Spring 2001	Fall 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Sum- mer 2008	Fall 2009 "Total"	Fall 2010 "Total"	Fall 2011 "Total"	Spring 2012 "Total"
<b>Mean Composites</b>													
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.54	3.60	3.63 3.61 3.67	3.62	3.63	3.61	3.62	3.61	3.56	3.60	3.57	3.59	3.61
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.29	3.33 3.30 3.36	3.33	3.33	3.30	3.36	3.30	3.27	3.32	3.28	3.32	3.35
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.71	3.77	3.80 3.77 3.84	3.77	3.78	3.79	3.75	3.77	3.74	3.85	3.77	3.83	3.84
<b>Median Composites</b>													
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.56	3.67	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.33	3.33 3.33 3.38	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.42	3.33	3.30	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.40
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.80	4.00 3.80 4.00	3.80	3.80	3.80	3.80	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

**Table 6C**  
**Differences in Summary Composite Section Ratings Across Surveys**

<b>Rating Area</b> <i>(in order, differences between Spring 2002 and Fall 2001 represent: total sample, cross-sectional sample, and panel sample)</i>	<b>Difference:</b> Fall 2001 – Spring 2001	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2002 – Fall 2001	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2003 – Spring 2002 <sup>a</sup>	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2004 – Spring 2003	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2005 – Spring 2004	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2006 – Spring 2005	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2007 – Spring 2006	<b>Difference:</b> Summer 2008 – Spring 2007	<b>Difference:</b> Fall 2009 “Total” – Summer 2008	<b>Difference:</b> Fall 2010 “Total” – Fall 2009	<b>Difference:</b> Fall 2011 “Total” – Fall 2010	<b>Difference:</b> Spring 2012 “Total” – Fall 2011
<b>Differences in Mean Composite Scores</b>												
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	+.06	+.03 +.01 +.07	+.01	+.01	-.02	+.01	-.01	-.05	+.04	-.03	+.02	+.02
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	+.07	+.04 +.01 +.07	+.03	+.00	-.03	+.06	-.06	-.03	+.05	-.04	+.04	+.03
<i>Traveler services</i>	+.06	+.03 +.00 +.07	+.00	+.01	+.01	-.04	+.02	-.03	+.11	-.08	+.07	+.01
<b>Differences in Median Composite Scores</b>												
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	+.09	+.00 +.00 +.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	+.11	+.00 +.00 +.05	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.09	-.09	-.03	+.03	.00	.00	+.07
<i>Traveler services</i>	+.00	+.20 +.00 +.20	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.20	-.20	+.20	.00	.00	.00

<sup>a</sup>To calculate this difference, the cross-sectional mean (mean in middle position) was used for the Spring 2002 results.

## Overall ratings of IDOT and employees and general trust in IDOT

**Overall job IDOT is doing.** In 2012 – for the total group results, one in twenty (5%) gave IDOT an overall rating of “excellent” while just over half (52%) responded with “good.” Just over one-third (34%) said “fair” while just over one in twenty gave a rating of “poor” (6%) and a few indicated “very poor” (2%). The average (mean) rating is 3.53. (See the middle of Table 7A.) The population-weighted results are virtually the same (mean of 3.53).

Across the survey series, with one exception, the mean rating for IDOT’s overall job performance ranges from 3.53 to 3.63 (the exception being 3.50 in 2008). The total group means for the 2009 and 2010 surveys are in the middle of this range (3.59 and 3.57), while the latest 2011 and 2012 means are at the bottom of this range (3.53). However, if the mean scores of the respondent group most comparable to the earlier survey samples (the “LLD group,” those who are licensed drivers in directory-“listed” households) are used for the most recent 2009 through 2012 surveys, we would find that these mean ratings scores are the middle of this range.<sup>18</sup>

To illustrate the changes these ratings took from their “high point” in 2003 and 2004 to the “low point” in 2008, the percent who gave an “excellent” rating decreased from only 6 percent in these earlier years to 4 percent in 2008. At the same time, the percent who gave either an “excellent” or a “good” rating declined somewhat from 62 percent to 56 percent. And, the percent who gave either a “poor” or “very poor” rating increased from 4 percent to 12 percent.

Over the past four years – for the total group results, the percent who gave an “excellent” rating is stable at 5 to 6 percent while the percent who gave either an “excellent” or “good” rating declined from 60 and 59 percent, in 2009 and 2010, to 56 and 57 percent in 2011 and 2012, respectively. At the other end of the scale, the percent who gave either a “poor” or “very poor” is 5 percent in 2009 and in the range of 7 to 8 percent in 2010 through 2012.

**General trust.** For the eighth year in a row, respondents were asked, “Generally speaking, how often do you think you can trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?” In 2012 – for the total group results, over seven in ten respondents (73%) chose either “just about always” (16%) or “most of the time” (57%). Just over one-fifth of the respondents (21%) chose “only some of the time,” and about one in twenty (6%) chose “hardly ever.” (See the bottom of Table 7A. The population-weighted results are slightly more positive.) Note that these results are based on the 74 percent of sample members who gave a rating; in other words, just over one-quarter did not offer an opinion here.

The 2012 mean rating is within the small range of 2.81 to 2.84 we find over the last six surveys. When the 2005 and 2006 mean scores are adjusted, they are found to be a bit lower than those in the more recent surveys (2.78 and 2.75, respectively).<sup>19</sup> If the mean scores of the respon-

---

<sup>18</sup> In 2009 and 2010, the LLD mean was equivalent to, or very similar to, the total group mean and thus was not commented upon.

<sup>19</sup> In 2007 through 2012, the response alternative “never” was not asked as it had been in 2005 and 2006. The “never” alternative had received very few responses in both 2005 and 2006 (about 1%), and eliminating it makes

dent group most comparable to the earlier survey samples (the “LLD group,” those who are licensed drivers in directory-“listed” households) are used for the most recent 2009 through 2012 surveys, we would see that the 2009 and 2011 mean ratings are within the 2.81-to-2.84 range, while both the 2010 and 2012 mean ratings are slightly above this range (2.88 and 2.87).

**Ratings of employees.** First here, we should note that the items here result in fewer respondents who actually give a rating, compared to the items summarized thus far. This has always been the case for the items in this section and is not surprising, given the fact that fewer respondents actually come into contact with IDOT employees than experience most of the highway-related aspects in the first three sections. Further, we generally find that the proportion of respondents who gave a rating is positively related to the overall favorability of the rating. To illustrate, nearly six in ten respondents rated the most positive of the items here, over half did so for the second most positive item, and well under half did so for the items ranked #3 and #4.

**The 2012 results.** The rank order of these four Employee Performance aspects in 2012 is the same as that for previous surveys. Again, and according to the total group results, the most positive rating goes to “courtesy and respect shown to motorists” (mean of 3.85 in 2012; with 74% giving “excellent” or “good”) followed by “overall conduct on the job” (3.80; with 72% giving “excellent” or “good”) and then “helpfulness of the information provided” (3.77; with 69% giving “excellent” or “good”). The aspect rated least positive is “accessibility of employees” (3.55; with 59% giving “excellent” or “good”). (See Table 7A for the 2012 results.) The population-weighted results here do not differ much at all.

Here, it is also useful to examine the 2012 survey mean ratings for the licensed drivers in “listed” households – the “exact” comparison group to surveys prior to 2009.<sup>20</sup> Means for this comparison group here are consistently more positive than are the total group mean ratings: 3.95 vs. 3.85 for courtesy and respect shown to motorists; 3.86 vs. 3.80 for overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job; 3.86 vs. 3.75 for helpfulness of information; and 3.61 vs. 3.55 for accessibility. This was also the case in 2009 through 2011.<sup>21</sup>

---

the response alternatives more balanced and more comparable to the “trust question” more usually asked in surveys.

<sup>20</sup> “Listed” households are households with directory-listed telephone numbers (labeled the “LLD Group” in the 2009 report – for Listed Licensed Drivers). We present these results here because, in 2009, this was the only section where we saw consistent differences of the greatest magnitude (though actually fairly small) between the total group results and results from licensed drivers in “listed” households. It should be noted that the results for this “LLD” group are based on far fewer respondents (less than 300 who gave ratings in this section) than most other items and have greater sampling errors.

<sup>21</sup>, the magnitudes of the differences in 2012 are in the range of +0.06 to +0.10. The magnitudes of the differences in 2011 are in the range of +0.04 to +0.06. The magnitudes of the differences in 2010 were in the range of +0.03 to +0.06, and those in 2009 were in the range of +0.05 to +0.07. Again, it should be noted that the results for this “LLD” group are based on far fewer respondents than most other items and thus have greater sampling errors.

**Changes over time.** Using the total group mean scores, an examination of the changes *from 2011 to 2012* shows increases in all of the mean ratings here, albeit two very small and within the 0.04 defined as stability earlier. The other two are for:

- Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (+0.07, 3.70 to 3.77)
- Accessibility of employees when you need them (+0.05, 3.50 to 3.55)

*Compared to 2010 (two years ago)*, the 2012 means are all more positive. But, all are within the 0.04 earlier defined as stable (+0.03 or +0.04).

*Compared to 2009 (three years ago)*, the 2012 means are all more positive. But, two are within the 0.04 earlier defined as stable (+0.03 or +0.04). Larger increases are found for:

- Accessibility of employees when you need them (+0.09, 3.46 to 3.55)
- Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (+0.05, 3.72 to 3.77)

*And, compared to 2007 (five years ago)*, three of the 2012 means are stable (a slight decline for one; slight increases for two). An increase is found for one item:

- Accessibility of employees when you need them (+0.06, 3.49 to 3.55)

**The 2012 results in the context of the survey series.** A summary of the 2012 results in the context of the entire 2001-through-2012 survey series is presented in Table Trend Summary 7. This table presents: the items, in order of the 2012 results; the range of the mean scores for each item over the survey series; any outlier that is present in this range; the range of mean scores, excluding the outlier; and the 2012 mean score result, along with any applicable comments regarding the 2012 mean in the context of the entire survey series.

**Table Trend Summary 7**  
**Ratings of IDOT Employees, 2001 through 2012**  
 (based on recent “Total Group” results)

IDOT Employee Aspects	Range	Outlier (if any)	Range excluding Outlier	2012 result - and comments
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	3.66-3.89	3.66 (2001)	3.81-3.89	(3.85)
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	3.64-3.82	3.64 (2001)	3.75-3.82	(3.80)
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	3.59-3.78	3.59 (2001)	3.70-3.78	2 <sup>nd</sup> highest, (3.77)
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	3.34-3.58	3.34 (2001)	3.46-3.58	In top six (3.55)

<sup>a</sup>Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.

This summary reveals that one 2012 mean rating is second-most positive (“2<sup>nd</sup> highest”):

3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees

In addition, the 2012 mean rating for the following is in the top six (with two tied at 3.58, and then four at 3.55):

4. Accessibility of employees when you need them

**Table 7A**  
**Ratings of IDOT's Employees on Selected Aspects**  
**and Overall Rating of IDOT Performance**

<b>Aspect rated<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Excellent (5)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Fair (3)</b>	<b>Poor (2)</b>	<b>Very Poor (1)</b>	<b><i>unwgt'd</i> <i>n</i> [% of Total]</b>	<b><i>mean</i></b>
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	18% (19%)	56% (54%)	21% (22%)	3% (2%)	2% (3%)	610 [57%]	3.85 (3.83)
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	16% (17%)	56% (56%)	22% (22%)	4% (3%)	2% (2%)	557 [52%]	3.80 (3.81)
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	15% (15%)	55% (54%)	23% (24%)	4% (4%)	2% (2%)	478 [44%]	3.77 (3.76)
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	12% (12%)	47% (49%)	28% (27%)	9% (9%)	4% (3%)	466 [43%]	3.55 (3.57)
<b>Overall performance:</b> How would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Dept of Transportation is doing?	<b>5% (6%)</b>	<b>52% (52%)</b>	<b>34% (35%)</b>	<b>6% (6%)</b>	<b>2% (2%)</b>	958 [89%]	<b>3.53 (3.53)</b>
<b>General trust:</b>	<b>Just about always (4)</b>	<b>Most of the time (3)</b>	<b>Only some of the time (2)</b>	<b>Hardly ever (1)</b>	<b>Never (not asked 2007 - 2010)</b>	<b><i>n</i> (% of total)</b>	<b><i>mean</i></b>
How often trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?	<b>16% (18%)</b>	<b>57% (58%)</b>	<b>21% (19%)</b>	<b>6% (6%)</b>	---	803 [74%]	<b>2.84 [3.84]<sup>c</sup> (2.88)</b>

<sup>a</sup>Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age, and race/ethnicity). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

<sup>b</sup>The actual scales (for both scales) in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

<sup>c</sup>In 2007 through 2012, the response alternative "never" was not asked as it had been in 2005 and 2006. The "never" alternative had received very few responses in both 2005 and 2006 (about 1%), and eliminating it makes the response alternatives more balanced and more comparable to the "trust question" more usually asked in surveys. If the 1-to-4 scale in 2011 is scored on a 2-to-5 scale (thus more comparable to the 2005 and 2007 results), the means becomes 3.84.

**Table 7B**  
**Mean Ratings of IDOT's Employees on Selected Aspects and Overall Rating of IDOT Performance: Trends Across Surveys**

<b>Aspect rated</b>	<b>Spring 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2001 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel</b>	<b>Spring 2003 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2004 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2005 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2006 means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2007 means (n)</b>	<b>Summer 2008 means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 "Total" means (n)</b>	<b>Spring 2012 "Total" means (n)</b>
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	3.66 (640)	3.81 (612)	3.86 3.81 3.92	3.89 (887)	3.89 (819)	3.86 (804)	3.87 (802)	3.88 (870)	3.87 (767)	3.82 (584) [3.89]*	3.81 (671) [3.85]*	3.82 (666) [3.86]*	3.85 (610) [3.95]*
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	3.64 (598)	3.79 (554)	3.82 3.76 3.88	3.81 (818)	3.79 (744)	3.75 (740)	3.78 (730)	3.79 (801)	3.82 (690)	3.76 (530) [3.83]	3.77 (622) [3.82]	3.76 (598) [3.80]	3.80 (557) [3.86]
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	3.59 (507)	3.70 (456)	3.78 3.73 3.84	3.78 (713)	3.76 (621)	3.73 (651)	3.74 (623)	3.74 (687)	3.75 (571)	3.72 (451) [3.76]	3.73 (533) [3.79]	3.70 (499) [3.75]	3.77 (478) [3.86]
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	3.34 (485)	3.55 (447)	3.52 3.46 3.60	3.58 (687)	3.58 (588)	3.55 (622)	3.55 (611)	3.49 (683)	3.52 (564)	3.46 (454) [3.51]	3.51 (539) [3.54]	3.50 (489) [3.56]	3.55 (466) [3.61]
<b>How would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Dept of Transportation is doing?</b>	<b>3.53 (1271)</b>	<b>3.56 (1157)</b>	<b>3.63 3.59 3.68</b>	<b>3.63 (1361)</b>	<b>3.63 (1249)</b>	<b>3.58 (1260)</b>	<b>3.60 (1265)</b>	<b>3.54 (1308)</b>	<b>3.50 (1198)</b>	<b>3.59 (908) [3.59]</b>	<b>3.57 (1033) [3.59]</b>	<b>3.53 (975) [3.60]</b>	<b>3.53 (958) [3.60]</b>
<b>How frequently do you trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues? (recoded)</b>	----	----	----	----	----	<b>2.78** (918)</b>	<b>2.75** (1026)</b>	<b>2.81 (1020)</b>	<b>2.83 (981)</b>	<b>2.83 (761) [2.82]</b>	<b>2.84 (870) [2.88]</b>	<b>2.81 (825) [2.83]</b>	<b>2.84 (803) [2.87]</b>

\*The mean scores in brackets [ ] are mean scores for the "LLD" respondent group, those "most" comparable to the survey samples prior to 2009 (licensed drivers in listed households). \*\* For the trust question at the bottom, mean scores in 2005 and 2006 have been adjusted downward, per footnote c in Table 7A.

**Assessed importance of IDOT for area.** Respondents were asked “how important [they] think IDOT is for [their] area’s economy” and “for [their] area’s overall quality of life.” The same questions were asked in the 2005 survey and in the 2007 through 2011 surveys. (See Table 8.)

**Table 8**  
**Assessed Importance of IDOT for Area**

IDOT’s importance for ...	Very Important (5) <sup>a</sup>	Important (4)	Some-what important (3)	Not very important (2)	Not at all important (1)	unwgt <sup>d</sup> n [% of total]	mean
<b>Area’s economy</b>							
<b>2012<sup>b</sup></b>	41% (44%)	36% (35%)	17% (16%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	918 [85%]	4.12 (4.15)
<b>2011<sup>b</sup></b>	42% (45%)	36% (34%)	18% (17%)	4% (3%)	1% (1%)	932 [88%]	4.14 (4.18)
<b>2010<sup>b</sup></b>	40% (42%)	39% (39%)	17% (16%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	965 [85%]	4.16 (4.18)
<b>2009<sup>b</sup></b>	41% (41%)	40% (40%)	14% (13%)	5% (5%)	1% (2%)	878 [86%]	4.14 (4.14)
<b>2008</b>	46%	34%	17%	3%	0+%	1101 [84%]	4.22
<b>2007</b>	44%	38%	13%	4%	1%	1234 [87%]	4.20
<b>2005</b>	32%	46%	18%	3%	1%	1144 [86%]	4.06
<b>Area’s overall quality of life</b>							
<b>2012<sup>b</sup></b>	43% (47%)	37% (35%)	15% (14%)	4% (4%)	1% (1%)	886 [82%]	4.17 (4.23)
<b>2011<sup>b</sup></b>	42% (45%)	38% (36%)	16% (16%)	3% (2%)	1% (1%)	896 [85%]	4.18 (4.21)
<b>2010<sup>b</sup></b>	41% (41%)	41% (41%)	15% (14%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	928 [81%]	4.20 (4.20)
<b>2009<sup>b</sup></b>	41% (42%)	41% (40%)	14% (12%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	848 [83%]	4.17 (4.19)
<b>2008</b>	45%	38%	14%	2%	0+%	1078 [82%]	4.25
<b>2007</b>	40%	41%	15%	3%	0+%	1170 [83%]	4.17
<b>2005</b>	33%	48%	16%	3%	0+%	1153 [87%]	4.10

<sup>a</sup>These values have been reversed from those in the questionnaire so that higher scores represent greater satisfaction.

<sup>b</sup>Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results.

For the 2012 total group results, just over three-quarters of the respondents (77%) responded that IDOT was either “very important” (41%) or “important” (36%) for their area’s economy while 17 percent said it was “somewhat important” and one in twenty (5%) said it was either “not very” (4%) or “not at all important” (1%). The distribution for assessed importance on the area’s overall quality of life is just slightly more positive – with eight in ten (80%) saying either “very important” or “important.” (Overall, the population-weighted results are slightly more positive for the assessed importance on the area’s economy and somewhat more positive for the importance on their area’s overall quality of life.)

Overall, the 2012 importance assessments for their area’s economy are slightly less positive than was the case in the 2009 through 2011 surveys (mean of 4.12 in 2012 vs. 4.14 to 4.16 in the three previous surveys). In turn, the 2009 through 2011 survey means are somewhat less positive than they were in 2008 and 2007 (4.22 and 4.20). However, all of these assessments are more positive than was the case in 2005 (4.06).

For the assessments of the importance of IDOT on their area’s quality of life, the 2012 mean is about on par with the 2011 and 2009 survey means (all 4.17 to 4.18), and just slightly less than the 2010 mean (4.20). All are somewhat less positive than the 2008 assessments (4.25) and more positive than was the case in 2005 (4.10).

## **Awareness and use of toll-free telephone number and website**

**Toll-free telephone number.** For the 2012 total group results, over two-thirds (69%) indicated not being aware of IDOT’s toll-free number to get information on road conditions. Nearly one-quarter (24%) are aware of it but have never called while the remaining 7 percent said they had called it, 1 percent having done so in the past year. The population-weighted results show somewhat more who are not aware of the toll-free number (74%) and 5 percent who have ever called. (See Table 9A.)

The recent 2012 and 2011 results show slightly less awareness than existed in the 2009 and 2010 surveys (69% for the former vs. 66% for the latter) and similar to the lack of awareness proportions from 2003 through 2008 (68% to 69%). (See Table 9A.)

**Website.** For the 2012 total group results, just over six in ten (61%) respondents indicated not being aware of IDOT’s website that contains information on construction zones and road conditions. One-quarter (25%) are aware of it but have never visited it while the remaining 13 percent said they have visited it. For each of these categories, the population-weighted results are within 2%. (See Table 9B.)

Over the past ten years, the percent not aware of the website has decreased by 16 percentage points -- from just over three-quarters in 2003 and 2004, to just 70 percent in 2005, then to about two-thirds in 2006 through 2008, and now to just over 60 percent in 2009 through 2012. And, the total percent who indicated they have been to the website has doubled -- from about 5 to 6 percent in 2003 and 2004, to 8 and 9 percent in 2005 and 2006, to 11 to 12 percent in

2007 through 2009, and then to 13 to 14 percent in the past three years. In the most recent five surveys, about one in ten indicated having done so in the past year. (See Table 9B.)

**Table 9A**  
**Awareness and Use of IDOT Toll-Free Number**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Spring 2003</b>	<b>Spring 2004</b>	<b>Spring 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>	<b>Spring 2007</b>	<b>Sum-mer 2008</b>	<b>Fall 2009<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Fall 2010<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Fall 2011<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Spring 2012<sup>a</sup></b>
NOT aware	68%	69%	69%	68%	68%	68%	66% (69%)	66% (69%)	69% (71%)	69% (74%)
Aware -- but never called	24%	23%	24%	26%	24%	24%	26% (24%)	25% (23%)	25% (24%)	24% (21%)
Called, but not in last 12 months	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6% (5%)	7% (6%)	4% (4%)	6% (4%)
Called in last 12 months	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2% (2%)	2% (1%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)
<i>n</i>	1353 (95%)	1260 (94%)	1254 (95%)	1252 (95%)	1318 (93%)	1252 (95%)	952 [94%]	1078 [95%]	998 [94%]	994 [92%]

<sup>a</sup>Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results.

**Table 9B**  
**Awareness and Use of IDOT's Internet Site**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Spring 2003</b>	<b>Spring 2004</b>	<b>Spring 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>	<b>Spring 2007</b>	<b>Sum-mer 2008</b>	<b>Fall 2009<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Fall 2010<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Fall 2011<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Spring 2012<sup>a</sup></b>
NOT aware of website	77%	77%	71%	67%	69%	66%	61% (63%)	62% (62%)	63% (64%)	61% (63%)
Aware -- but never visited	17%	18%	21%	23%	21%	22%	27% (26%)	25% (24%)	24% (23%)	25% (25%)
To website but not for this info	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3% (3%)	4% (5%)	3% (3%)	3% (3%)
Looked at this info on website	4%	4%	6%	7%	8%	10%	9% (8%)	9% (9%)	11% (10%)	10% (9%)
<i>n</i>	1344 (94%)	1246 (94%)	1239 (93%)	1232 (93%)	1284 (91%)	1236 (94%)	941 [93%]	1069 [94%]	986 [93%]	988 [92%]

<sup>a</sup>Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results.

## Topical questions

As noted earlier, this year's topical issue questions focused on the topics of Amtrak and high-speed rail.

### Amtrak questions

How far respondents live from an Amtrak station and the number of times riding Amtrak trains in Illinois; the main reasons respondents would travel on Amtrak, and the main reasons they would not regularly ride Amtrak when traveling; what changes in Amtrak service would make them trying using Amtrak service; and whether/where they remember seeing/hearing any advertising for Amtrak passenger train service in the last few months (page 3)

### High-speed rail questions

Opinions regarding high-speed rail in Illinois and whether Illinois should apply for federal funds for it (page 4); whether any high-speed route between Chicago and St. Louis should go through the same cities as the current Amtrak route; and likelihood of using high-speed rail on three possible routes (page 3)

## Opinions relating to Amtrak

For the results in this section, our focus will be on the population-weighted results. Total group results are also reported (all respondents weighted only by IDOT district). As noted earlier, the population-weighted results – which are weighted by geographic area, age, education and gender – better reflect the Illinois population. (Differences between the results are very to extremely small.)

**Distance / time from Amtrak.** Respondents were first asked how far they live from a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois and then asked how long (time) it takes them to get to the closest train station that has a current Amtrak stop. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 1.

**Distance from city with Amtrak station.** For the population-weighted results, we find that nearly one-quarter (23%) of the respondents reported they live in a city with an Amtrak station, and about half (57%) reported they live within 25 miles of such a city (including living in the city). Over seven in ten (72%) reported they live within 50 miles of an Amtrak station city while only 6 percent reported they live further than this. Just over one in five (22%) did not know or did not answer the question. Taken as a whole, these results are quite consistent with those found in the 2009 and 2010 surveys.

**Length of time to get to closest Amtrak station.** For the 2012 population-weighted results, we find that over four in ten of the respondents (43%) reported they can get to the closest Amtrak station within ½ hour, nearly six in ten (58%) reported they can do so within 45 minutes, and about two-thirds (68%) can do so within 1 hour. Seven percent (7%) reported it takes longer. Almost one-quarter (24%) of the respondents either did not know or did not answer the question.

These results are very close to those found in the 2010 survey. But, we will note that in 2009, slightly fewer reported living within 30 minutes (40% vs. 43%), living within 45 minutes (54% vs. 58-59%), and living within 1 hour (66% vs. 68-69%).

**Amtrak ridership.** Respondents were asked whether they have ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois. If so, they were then asked how many times they had done so in the past 12 months. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 2.

As seen in this table, somewhat less than half (46%) of the respondents indicated they have ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois. Of these, over one-third (37%) indicated they have not done so in the past 12 months. Translated into all respondents, we find that two-thirds (68%) have not ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois within the past 12 months while nearly three in ten (28%) indicated they have. About one in six (17%) indicated they have done so once or twice, while just over one in ten (12%) indicated they have ridden an Amtrak train more than this in the past 12 months.

These results are very close to the results found in the 2010 survey. Compared to the 2009 results, fewer 2010 and 2012 respondents report never having ridden Amtrak in the past 12 months (68-69% vs. 74%). About the same percentage report riding Amtrak once or twice (17-18%), while more 2010 and 2012 respondents report riding Amtrak three or more times (11-12% vs. 7%).

**Amtrak Table 1**  
**Distance and Time from Residence to Amtrak Stop**  
**(Questions 1 and 2)**

<b>How far away do you live from a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois?</b>	<b>2009</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2009</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Live in city with stop	21%	24%	22%	26%	20%	23%
1 to 25 miles	32%	29%	30%	28%	35%	34%
26 to 50 miles	20%	19%	19%	17%	18%	15%
51 to 75 miles	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%	4%
More than 75 miles	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	20%	22%	20%	23%	20%	22%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	
<b>How long does it take you to get to the closest train station that has a current Amtrak stop?</b>						
Up to 30 minutes	40%	40%	42%	43%	41%	43%
31 to 45 minutes	15%	14%	16%	16%	16%	15%
46 minutes to 1 hour	12%	12%	10%	10%	12%	10%
Over 1 hour / up to 1 ½ hours	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%	6%
More than 1 ½ hours	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%
Don't know / no answer	23%	25%	21%	23%	23%	24%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	

**Amtrak Table 2: Amtrak Ridership  
(Questions 3 and 3A)**

	<b>2009</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2009</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
<b>Have you ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois?</b>						
Yes	46%	45%	46%	47%	46%	46%
No	53%	54%	51%	50%	53%	53%
Don't know	1%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%
	<i>(n = 993; 98% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1132; 99% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1057; 98% of sample)</i>	
<b><u>Of those who have:</u> How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months? (count round-trip as 2)</b>						
Never	44%	43%	35%	35%	39%	38%
Once or twice	38%	39%	37%	37%	32%	33%
Three to five times	9%	9%	14%	14%	14%	16%
More than five times	6%	6%	8%	8%	7%	7%
Don't know	2%	3%	6%	6%	7%	7%
	<i>(n = 451; 44% of sample; 97% of relevant respondents)</i>		<i>(n = 553; 48% of sample; includes some initial "don't know" if ever respondents)</i>		<i>(n = 503; 47% of sample; includes some initial "don't know" if ever respondents)</i>	
<b><u>Based on all respondents:</u> How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months? (count round-trip as 2)</b>						
Never	74%	74%	71%	69%	70%	69%
Once or twice	18%	18%	17%	18%	15%	16%
Three to five times	4%	4%	6%	7%	7%	8%
More than five times	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%
Don't know	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%	4%
	<i>(n = 977; 96% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1123; 98% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1057; 98% of sample)</i>	

**Main reasons for traveling by train in Illinois.** Respondents were asked to identify “the MAIN reason(s) [they] would be most likely to travel by train in Illinois.” They were offered seven pre-selected reasons as well as an “other”/specify option. Respondents could also indicate they would never travel by train. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 3.

The top reason, selected by just over one-third, is that the train is “faster and less risky than driving” (34%). This is followed closely by the “higher cost of gasoline” (29%) and then it is “cheaper than any other type of travel” (27%). About half as many selected “faster train speeds and more reliable service than in the past” (13%), with two other reasons right behind this: “can get more work done on the train” (12%); and “trains are more environmentally friendly than other types of travel” (12%). Note that about one in five (21%) either indicated they would never travel by train (16%) or gave no reason in this question (5%).

We further examined the results here for those who said they had never ridden Amtrak (69% of the respondents), and for those who said they had ridden Amtrak in the past year (27% of the respondents). Not surprisingly, we find that those who have never ridden Amtrak were far more likely than recent Amtrak riders to either indicate they would never travel on a train or did not give a reason for doing so (27% vs. 3%). However, there is basically no difference in the rank order of the specific reasons between the two groups. But, also not surprising, recent riders are more likely than those who have never ridden Amtrak to choose nearly all of the reasons, sometimes substantially so. The exceptions here are: “free internet access on the train” (4% for recent riders vs. 5% for non-riders); and the “higher cost of gasoline” (32% for recent riders, only a bit greater than the 29% for non-riders).

**Main reasons for NOT regularly ride Amtrak when traveling.** Respondents were asked to identify “the MAIN reason(s) [they] do NOT regularly ride Amtrak when traveling.” They were offered six pre-selected reasons as well as an “other”/specify option. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 4.

Two reasons were most frequently chosen, each by about three in ten respondents: “trains don’t travel near where you want to go” (31%); and “would always rather drive” (29%). About half as many chose the next two reasons: “the closest Amtrak station is too far away” (16%); and “would always rather fly” (15%). And, about half as many again chose the next two items: “not enough train times available at your closest station/stop” (8%); and “train schedules aren’t reliable” (6%). Note that 7 percent either did not give a reason or indicated the question is not applicable to them.

We further examined the results here for those who said they had never ridden Amtrak (69% of the respondents), and for those who said they had ridden Amtrak in the past year (27% of the respondents). Not surprisingly, we find that those who have ridden Amtrak in the past year were more likely than those who have never ridden Amtrak to either not answer the question or to indicate the question was not applicable to them (13% vs. 4%). Apart from this, there is really relatively little difference in the frequency with which the respective reasons are chosen by the two groups.

**Amtrak Table 3**

<b>Main reasons would be most likely to travel by train in Illinois (Q-4)</b>	<b>District weight</b>	<b>Population weight</b>
Faster and less risky than driving	35%	34%
Higher cost of gasoline	30%	29%
Cheaper than other type of travel	26%	27%
Faster train speeds / more reliable than in past	14%	13%
Can get more work done on train	12%	12%
Trains more environmentally-friendly	13%	12%
Free internet access on trains	5%	5%
Other – most frequent below	14%	13%
<i>Fun / vacation / unique / novel</i>	4%	4%
<i>Going to big city / avoid traffic, parking</i>	2%	2%
<i>Relaxing / less stressful</i>	2%	1%
<i>Convenience</i>	1%	1%
<i>Don't drive / fly</i>	1%	1%
Would never ride train / no reasons	16%	16%
Don't know / no answer to particular question	4%	5%
<i>N</i>	1039 (96%)	1045 (97%)
<b>Main reasons would be most likely to travel by train in Illinois (Q-4)</b>	<b>Never Ridden Amtrak (popul-wgt)</b>	<b>Ride Amtrak in Past Year (popul-wgt)</b>
Faster and less risky than driving	31%	44%
Higher cost of gasoline	29%	32%
Cheaper than other type of travel	25%	31%
Faster train speeds / more reliable than in past	10%	20%
Can get more work done on train	9%	20%
Trains more environmentally-friendly	10%	18%
Free internet access on trains	5%	4%
Other – most frequent below	12%	16%
<i>Fun / vacation / unique / novel</i>	3%	4%
<i>Going to big city / avoid traffic, parking</i>	2%	5%
<i>Relaxing / less stressful</i>	1%	3%
<i>Convenience</i>	1%	1%
<i>Don't drive / fly</i>	1%	2%
Would never ride train / no reasons	21%	3%
Don't know / no answer to particular question	6%	0%
<i>n</i>	718 (99%)	280 (100%)

**Amtrak Table 4**

<b>Main reasons do NOT regularly ride Amtrak when traveling (Q-5)</b>	<b>District weight</b>	<b>Population weight</b>
Trains don't travel near where want to go	34%	31%
Would always rather drive	29%	29%
Closest Amtrak station/stop is too far	17%	16%
Would always rather fly	14%	15%
Not enough train times available at closest station/stop	9%	8%
Train schedules aren't reliable	7%	6%
Other – most frequent below	17%	18%
<i>Don't travel / no need for trains</i>	6%	6%
<i>Cost / price – total mentions</i>	3%	3%
<i>Time of ride / number of stops / speed</i>	2%	2%
<i>Need car at destination / for flexibility</i>	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer to particular question	5%	6%
Not applicable	1%	1%
<i>n</i>	1039 (96%)	1045 (97%)
<b>Main reasons do NOT regularly ride Amtrak when traveling (Q-5)</b>	<b>Never Ridden Amtrak (popul-wgt)</b>	<b>Ride Amtrak in Past Year (popul-wgt)</b>
Trains don't travel near where want to go	30%	31%
Would always rather drive	33%	29%
Closest Amtrak station/stop is too far	17%	16%
Would always rather fly	16%	15%
Not enough train times available at closest station/stop	7%	8%
Train schedules aren't reliable	5%	6%
Other – most frequent below	18%	21%
<i>Don't travel / no need for trains</i>	6%	6%
<i>Cost / price – total mentions</i>	3%	2%
<i>Time of ride / number of stops / speed</i>	2%	1%
<i>Need car at destination / for flexibility</i>	1%	1%
<i>Access to those with handicap</i>	0 <sup>+</sup> %	1%
Don't know / no answer to particular question	4%	9%
Not applicable	0 <sup>+</sup> %	4%
<i>n</i>	718 (99%)	280 (100%)

**What changes in Amtrak service would make respondent try using Amtrak service in Illinois.**

Respondents were asked “what changes in Amtrak service would make [them] try using Amtrak service in Illinois.” They were offered five pre-selected reasons as well as an “other”/specify option. Respondents could also indicate that no changes would make them try using Amtrak service. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 5.

Nearly half (49%) of the respondents either indicated there are no changes that could make them try using Amtrak service (38%) or did not give an answer to the question (11%). Two reasons were selected by more than one-quarter: “additional scheduling options / more trains on routes” (28%); and “shorter travel times through higher train speeds” (27%). Distantly following, and selected by nearly one in ten, is “availability of Wi-Fi and other business class services” (9%). And, about one in twenty chose the final two reasons presented: addition of a “sports” area/car (6%); and additional business class seating available (4%). Just over ten (12%) identified an “other” reason.

Again, we further examined the results here for those who said they had never ridden Amtrak (69% of the respondents), and for those who said they had ridden Amtrak in the past year (27% of the respondents). We find that those who have never ridden Amtrak were far more likely than recent Amtrak riders to either indicate there are no changes that could be made or did not give a change (56% vs. 29%). And thus, recent riders are more likely than those who have never ridden Amtrak to choose nearly all of the reasons, sometimes substantially so. The exception here is in the proportion who gave an “other” response (12-13% for each group). And within the “other” responses given, it should be noted that 3 percent of the non-riders identified cost as a reason while hardly any recent riders did so. For the presented reasons, there is basically no difference in the rank order of the specific reasons between the two groups.

**Whether and where have seen/heard Amtrak advertising.** Respondents were asked, “In the last few months, do you remember seeing or hearing any advertising for Amtrak passenger train service? If so, where have you seen or heard it?” They were offered six pre-selected sources as well as an “other”/specify option. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 6.

Two-thirds of the respondents (67%) indicated they don’t remember seeing/hearing any recent advertising for Amtrak (64%) or did not give a source of awareness (3%). Nearly one-quarter (23%) identified television as their source, very distantly followed by those identifying radio (8%) and newspapers (7%). About half as many selected the Internet (4%), and very few selected the U.S. mail (1%). Among the “other” responses, billboards (1%) was most frequently identified.

**Amtrak Table 5**

<b>Changes in Amtrak service that would make you try using Amtrak service in Illinois (Q-6)</b>	<b>District weight</b>	<b>Population weight</b>
Additional scheduling options / more trains on routes	29%	28%
Shorter travel times through higher train speeds	28%	27%
Availability of Wi-Fi and other business class services	9%	9%
Addition of a “sports” area/car on trains	6%	6%
Additional business class seating available	5%	4%
Other – most frequent below	12%	12%
<i>Cost / price</i>	2%	2%
<i>Closer station</i>	2%	2%
<i>Routes / destinations / stops / frequency</i>	2%	2%
<i>Reliable service</i>	1%	1%
Are no changes that could be made / would never ride train	38%	38%
Don’t know / no answer to particular question	11%	11%
<i>N</i>	1039 (96%)	1045 (97%)
<b>Changes in Amtrak service that would make you try using Amtrak service in Illinois (Q-6)</b>	<b>Never Ridden Amtrak (popul-wgt)</b>	<b>Ride Amtrak in Past Year (popul-wgt)</b>
Additional scheduling options / more trains on routes	24%	39%
Shorter travel times through higher train speeds	23%	39%
Availability of Wi-Fi and other business class services	7%	14%
Addition of a “sports” area/car on trains	5%	12%
Additional business class seating available	3%	7%
Other – most frequent below	13%	12%
<i>Cost / price</i>	3%	0 <sup>+</sup> %
<i>Closer station</i>	2%	1%
<i>Routes / destinations / stops / frequency</i>	2%	1%
<i>Reliable service</i>	1%	2%
<i>Seats / tickets</i>	0 <sup>+</sup> %	1%
<i>Quiet cars</i>	0 <sup>+</sup> %	1%
Are no changes that could be made / would never ride train	45%	24%
Don’t know / no answer to particular question	11%	5%
<i>N</i>	718 (99%)	280 (100%)

**Amtrak Table 6**

<b>Whether recently seen / heard Amtrak advertising – and where (Q-7)</b>	<b>District weight</b>	<b>Population weight</b>
Don't remember seeing / hearing advertising	64%	64%
Television	22%	23%
Radio	8%	8%
Newspaper	8%	7%
Internet	3%	4%
U.S. mail	1%	1%
Other – most frequent below	3%	3%
<i>Billboards</i>	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer to particular question	3%	3%
<i>n</i>	1039 (96%)	1045 (97%)

## **Opinions relating to High-Speed Rail Service**

**High-speed rail opinions.** Respondents were asked how much they favor or oppose having high-speed rail in Illinois and then were asked whether they favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail. Results are presented in the top two sections of High-Speed Rail Table 1.<sup>22</sup>

***Favor or oppose high-speed rail in Illinois.*** Nearly six in ten 2012 respondents (58%) favor having high-speed rail in Illinois, with over one-quarter (27%) strongly in favor. Only 13 percent oppose it, while nearly three in ten (29%) did not express an opinion.

Compared to 2010, the biggest difference is the increase in those not expressing an opinion (22% to 29% in 2012). The increase in “no opinion” is reflected both in the slight decline in support from 2010 to 2012 (61% to 58%) as well as in the slight decline in opposition (16% to 13%). In 2009, 58 percent were in favor compared to 15 percent opposed, with 26 percent not expressing an opinion.

---

<sup>22</sup> Note that the questions regarding high-speed rail come after the questions relating to Amtrak service, as was the case in the 2009 and 2010 questionnaires. Although the 2012 questionnaire contains several more Amtrak-related questions than did the earlier questionnaires (with the 2012 questionnaire thus having more of an Amtrak topical emphasis), this positioning was thought to add to the comparability of the high-speed rail responses over time, as measured in the Motorist Opinion questionnaires. Yet, as one respondent pointed out, the earlier Amtrak questions largely assume the upcoming existence of high-speed rail. In this respondent's opinion, this could influence responses to the high-speed rail opinion question, particularly when questions which contain possible negative consequences of high-speed rail were not also asked. In response, we can note: 1) the assumption underlying the Amtrak questions appears realistic, given the fact that work on Illinois high-speed rail is currently underway; 2) the information solicited by the Amtrak questions thus appears useful and a focus here appears appropriate; 3) the positioning of the high-speed rail opinion questions allows greater comparability to the earlier questionnaires (while maintaining topical flow with Amtrak questions together); and, as is seen below, 4) we actually find more “no opinion” for the high-speed rail opinion question in the 2012 questionnaire and an accompanying slight decline in both support and opposition compared to the 2010 findings.

***Favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds.*** Compared to the above question, the 2012 distribution of opinion regarding whether Illinois should apply for federal funds shows somewhat fewer in favor – 50 percent, with nearly one-quarter (24%) strongly in favor. Just over one in five (22%) oppose this, with 30 percent not expressing an opinion.

Compared to 2010, the biggest difference is again the increase in those not expressing an opinion (24% to 30% in 2012). However, here the increase in “no opinion” is pretty much all reflected in a decline in support from 2010 to 2012 (54% to 50%) while opposition is at 22 percent in both the 2010 and 2012 surveys. In 2009, 55 percent were in favor compared to 20 percent opposed, with 26 percent not expressing an opinion.

***High-speed rail cities between Chicago and St. Louis.*** Respondents were also asked whether a high-speed rail route between Chicago and St. Louis should go through the same cities as the route does now. Results are presented in bottom section of High-Speed Rail Table 1. Six in ten (60%) 2012 respondents did not express an opinion. Those in favor of the route going through the same cities outnumber those opposed by more than two to one (28% vs. 13%).

Altogether, the findings on this question are very similar in 2009, 2010 and 2012. The number in favor of the same cities ranges only from 28 to 30 percent across these surveys. Those opposed is slightly higher in the most recent 2012 survey than in the earlier surveys (13% vs. 10%). And, those not expressing an opinion ranges only from 59 to 61 percent across the three surveys.

**High-Speed Rail Table 1: High Speed Rail Opinions  
(Questions 9, 10 and 11)**

	<b>2009</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2009</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
<b>How much do you favor or oppose having high-speed rail in Illinois? (Q-4)</b>						
Strongly favor	28%	27%	29%	29%	26%	27%
Favor	32%	32%	33%	32%	31%	31%
Oppose	9%	8%	10%	10%	7%	6%
Strongly oppose	6%	7%	7%	6%	7%	6%
Don't know / no answer	24%	26%	22%	22%	29%	29%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	
<b>How much do you favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail in Illinois? (Q-5)</b>						
Strongly favor	29%	25%	27%	26%	25%	24%
Favor	29%	30%	30%	28%	26%	26%
Oppose	10%	10%	12%	13%	11%	12%
Strongly oppose	9%	10%	10%	9%	11%	10%
Don't know / no answer	23%	26%	21%	24%	28%	30%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	
<b>If federal money for high-speed rail on Chicago-St. Louis route, should route go through same cities as it does now? (Q-7)</b>						
Yes	30%	29%	30%	30%	28%	28%
No	9%	10%	10%	10%	12%	13%
Don't know / no answer	60%	61%	59%	60%	60%	59%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	

**Projected ridership on three high-speed rail routes.** Respondents were asked how many times per year they would use high-speed rail if it were available on three possible routes. Results are presented in High-Speed Rail Table 2.

*The Chicago – St. Louis route.* About two-thirds of the respondents (66%) either said they never would use the route (44%) or did not express an opinion (22%). Thirteen percent (13%) said they would use it less it once a year and virtually the same number (13%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Seven percent said they would use it more.

Compared to the results in 2009 and 2010, the 2012 survey shows more who say they would never use the route (44% vs. 38% in the two earlier surveys).

*The Chicago – Milwaukee route.* Over seven in ten respondents (73%) either said they never would use the route (45%) or did not express an opinion (28%). One in ten (10%) said they would use it less it once a year and about the same number (11%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Six percent said they would use it more.

Compared to the results in 2009 and 2010, the 2012 survey shows more who say they would never use the route (45% vs. 39-40% in the two earlier surveys). And, when those who did not express an opinion are added to those who said they would never use it, we find that this percentage has increased across the three surveys, from 64 percent in 2009 to 69 percent in 2010 -- and to 73 percent in 2012.

*The Chicago – Detroit route.* Over eight in ten respondents (85%) either said they never would use the route (54%) or did not express an opinion (31%). Eight percent (8%) said they would use it less it once a year, and 5 percent said they would use it once or twice a year. Just over 1 percent said they would use it more.

Compared to the results in 2009 and 2010, the 2012 survey shows more who say they would never use the route (54% vs. 48-50% in the two earlier surveys).

**High-Speed Rail Table 2: Projected Ridership on Three High-Speed Rail Routes (Questions 8A, 8B and 8C)**

<b>How many times would you use high-speed rail on the following routes? (count round-trip as 2)</b>	<b>2009</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2009</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2010</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	<b>2012</b> Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
<b>A. Chicago – St. Louis route</b>						
Never	38%	38%	38%	38%	43%	44%
Less than once a year	17%	17%	16%	16%	14%	13%
Once or twice	16%	16%	18%	18%	14%	13%
Three to five times	4%	4%	4%	4%	6%	5%
More than five times	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	22%	22%	21%	21%	22%	22%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	
<b>B. Chicago – Milwaukee route</b>						
Never	40%	39%	40%	40%	45%	45%
Less than once a year	14%	14%	12%	12%	10%	10%
Once or twice	15%	16%	12%	13%	11%	11%
Three to five times	4%	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%
More than five times	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer	26%	25%	30%	29%	28%	28%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	
<b>C. Chicago – Detroit route</b>						
Never	50%	50%	49%	48%	55%	54%
Less than once a year	10%	11%	10%	11%	7%	8%
Once or twice	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%
Three to five times	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
More than five times	1%	1%	1%	1%	0+%	0+%
Don't know / no answer	31%	31%	32%	32%	31%	31%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1078; 100% of sample)</i>	

## APPENDIX A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

XXXX



### THE ILLINOIS MOTORIST OPINION SURVEY – Fall 2012

**WHO IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD SHOULD COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE:** Please have the youngest adult (18 years or older) in your household complete the survey. If he/she is not available, please have the adult with the next birthday complete it.

**WEB-VERSION:** The questionnaire can be completed on-line by going to: <http://url.uis.edu/IDOTMotoristSurvey>. You will be asked for your project identification number. It is at the top right-hand corner of this page.

#### WHAT HIGHWAYS ARE THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBLE FOR?

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) is responsible for the design, construction, and maintenance of state and federal highways in Illinois. But these **do NOT include the Illinois Tollways**. They also **do NOT include city streets and county (as well as township) roads**. Please keep this in mind when completing this questionnaire. We will remind you of this now and then throughout the questionnaire.

**How would you rate the performance of the Illinois Department of Transportation in each of the following areas?** (For each item, please circle a number or "DK".)

For these ratings we would like you to use the following rating scale:

1 = Excellent; 2 = Good; 3 = Fair; 4 = Poor; 5 = Very poor; and DK = don't know/no opinion

	EXCEL- LENT (1)	GOOD (2)	FAIR (3)	POOR (4)	VERY POOR (5)	DON'T KNOW (DK)
<b>MAINTAINING HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC FLOW</b>						
1. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
2. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
3. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
4. Snow and ice removal .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
5. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, and "miles to destination" signs): <i>consider clarity, visibility, number, and placement</i> .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
6. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number, and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
7. Visibility of lane and shoulder (edge) paint stripes on highways .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
8. Timing of traffic signals (stop-and-go lights) to maintain the flow of traffic .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
9. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visibility after dark and in bad weather .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
<b>ROAD REPAIR AND CONSTRUCTION</b>						
1. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (but not including Illinois Tollways) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
2. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (other Illinois state highways; do not include city streets or county/township roads) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
3. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstate highways (but not including Illinois Tollways) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
4. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on non-interstate highways (do not include city streets or county/township roads) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
5. The flow of traffic through workzones .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
6. Workzone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK

**For these ratings we would like you to use the following rating scale:**

**1 = Excellent; 2 = Good; 3 = Fair; 4 = Poor; 5 = Very poor; and DK = don't know/no opinion**

	EXCEL- LENT (1)	GOOD (2)	FAIR (3)	POOR (4)	VERY POOR (5)	DON'T KNOW (DK)
<b>ROAD REPAIR AND CONSTRUCTION (continued)</b>						
7. Warning signs when workers are present ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
8. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number, and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
9. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through television, radio, newspapers, and the Internet .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
10. Advance information about construction and repair projects that will start at a future date through informational signs on highways .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK

#### TRAVELER SERVICES

1. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
2. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
3. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, & lodging ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
4. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks ( <i>consider clarity, visibility, number and placement</i> ) .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK

#### IDOT TOLL-FREE NUMBER AND WEBSITE

- Before this survey, were you aware of IDOT's toll-free number (1-800-452-IDOT) to get information on current road conditions? Have you ever called this number? (*Please circle the one number from 0 to 3 that best describes you.*)
 

0 Was NOT aware of this toll-free number	2 Have called this number but NOT in last 12 months
1 Was aware of the number but have never called it	3 Have called this number in the last 12 months
- IDOT has a website ([www.dot.state.il.us](http://www.dot.state.il.us)) where you can get information on construction zones and road conditions. Before this survey, were you aware of this website? Have you ever visited this site to get this kind of information? (*Please circle the one number from 0 to 3 that best describes you.*)
 

0 Was NOT aware of the web-site	2 Have been to website but did NOT look at this information
1 Was aware of website but have never visited it	3 Have looked at this information on the IDOT website

#### RATINGS OF IDOT'S EMPLOYEES

Please rate IDOT's employees on EACH of the following aspects ...  
(For each aspect, please circle a number or "DK".)

	EXCEL- LENT (1)	GOOD (2)	FAIR (3)	POOR (4)	VERY POOR (5)	DON'T KNOW (DK)
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
2. Accessibility of employees when you need them .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK
4. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK

#### OVERALL RATINGS / OPINIONS OF IDOT

- Thinking about ALL the things we have asked you to rate, how would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Department of Transportation is doing? (*circle a number or "DK"*)
 

1	2	3	4	5	DK
---	---	---	---	---	----
- Generally speaking, how often do you think you can trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues? (*Please circle a number or "DK"*)
 

1 Just about always	3 Only some of the time	DK Don't know
2 Most of the time	4 Hardly ever	
- How important do you think IDOT is: (*circle a number or "DK"*) **FOR EACH QUESTION – A and B)**

<b>A. For your area's economy?</b>		<b>B. For your area's overall quality of life?</b>	
1 Very important	4 Not very important	1 Very important	4 Not very important
2 Important	5 Not at all important	2 Important	5 Not at all important
3 Somewhat important	DK Don't know	3 Somewhat important	DK Don't know

## OPINIONS RELATING TO AMTRAK AND HIGH-SPEED RAIL SERVICE

Next are a few questions that relate to Amtrak service and the possibility of high-speed rail service in Illinois. Note that Amtrak service is NOT mass transit commuter rail. (It is NOT Metra commuter rail in the Chicago area or MetroLink in the St. Louis area).

1. How far away do you live from a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois? *(Please check a box or circle "DK".)*

<input type="checkbox"/> you live in city that has a current Amtrak stop	<input type="checkbox"/> 51 to 75 miles away	DK Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 25 miles away	<input type="checkbox"/> 76 to 100 miles away	
<input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 50 miles away	<input type="checkbox"/> more than 100 miles away	
2. Which of the following best describes how long it takes you to get to the closest train station that has a current Amtrak stop? (Think of the usual kind of transportation you would take to get there and typical traffic.) *(Check a box or circle "DK".)*

<input type="checkbox"/> up to 30 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> over 1 hour / up to 1 ½ hours	DK Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> 31 to 45 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> over 1 ½ hours / up to 2 hours	
<input type="checkbox"/> 46 minutes to 1 hour	<input type="checkbox"/> over 2 hours	
3. Have you ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois? *(Please circle a number or "DK".)*
  - 1 Yes → IF YES, circle "1" and then ANSWER 3A BELOW
  - 2 No
  - DK Don't know

**3A. IF YOU HAVE EVER DONE THIS: In the past 12 months, how many times have you ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois? [Count a round-trip as 2 times.]** *(Check a box. Give us your best guess here. Circle "DK" only if you have no best guess.)*

<input type="checkbox"/> never	<input type="checkbox"/> six to ten times
<input type="checkbox"/> once or twice	<input type="checkbox"/> more than ten times
<input type="checkbox"/> three to five times	DK Don't know
4. What is/are the MAIN reason(s) you would be most likely to travel by train in Illinois? *(circle the numbers of all that apply)*

1 faster and less risky than driving	6 can get more work done on the train
2 faster train speeds & more reliable service than in the past	7 free internet access on the train
3 cheaper than any other type of travel	8 other – specify: _____
4 higher cost of gasoline	
5 trains are more environmentally friendly than other types of travel	9 you would never travel by train
5. What is/are the MAIN reason(s) you do NOT regularly ride Amtrak when traveling? *(circle the numbers of all that apply)*

1 would always rather drive	5 not enough train times available at your closest station/stop
2 would always rather fly	6 the closest Amtrak station/stop is too far away
3 trains don't travel near where you need to go	7 other – specify: _____
4 train schedules aren't reliable	
6. What changes in Amtrak service would make you try using Amtrak service in Illinois? *(circle the numbers of all that apply)*
  - 1 shorter travel times through higher train speeds
  - 2 additional scheduling options / more trains on routes
  - 3 availability of wireless internet service (Wi-Fi) & other business class services
  - 4 additional business class seating available
  - 5 addition of a "sports" area/car on trains, providing TV screens showing sports programming
  - 6 other – specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - 7 there are no changes that would make you try using Amtrak service
7. In the last few months, do you remember seeing or hearing any advertising for Amtrak passenger train service? If so, where have you seen or heard it? *(circle the numbers of all that apply)*

1 no; have not seen or heard any	5 on the Internet
2 in newspaper(s)	6 through U.S. mail to you
3 on television	7 other – specify: _____
4 on the radio	
8. How many times per year would you use high-speed rail (110-mph passenger trains) if it were available on the following routes? **Include travel in either direction and on any parts of the routes.** [Count a round-trip on the route as using the route twice.] *(check a box or circle "DK" for each route)*

	Never	Less than once / year	Once or twice	3 to 5 times	6 to 10 times	More than 10 times	Don't know
A. the Chicago - St. Louis route .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DK
B. the Chicago - Milwaukee route .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DK
C. the Chicago - Detroit route .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DK

9. How much do you favor or oppose having high-speed rail (110-mph passenger trains) in Illinois? (Circle a number or "DK".)
- |                  |                   |               |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1 Strongly favor | 3 Oppose          |               |
| 2 Favor          | 4 Strongly oppose | DK Don't know |
10. How much do you favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail in Illinois? (Circle a number or "DK".)
- |                  |                   |               |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1 Strongly favor | 3 Oppose          |               |
| 2 Favor          | 4 Strongly oppose | DK Don't know |
11. If federal money is made available to help fund high-speed rail from Chicago to St. Louis, do you think the high-speed route should go through the same cities as the current Amtrak Chicago-St. Louis route? (Please circle a number or "DK".)
- 1 Yes  
2 No  
DK Don't know / no opinion

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION.** We have a few more questions solely for the purpose of helping us analyze the results. Your responses will only be reported along with others so that no one will know your opinions or background information.

1. Are you currently a licensed driver? circle number → 1 YES 2 NO
2. Estimated number of miles you personally drive during a typical year: TYPICAL # OF MILES = \_\_\_\_\_
3. Commuting miles and drive time to / from work (specify number or circle "NA" for not applicable)
- |  |                      |       |
|--|----------------------|-------|
| A. Estimated number of <u>miles</u> to work (one-way):                   | # OF MILES = _____   | or NA |
| B. Estimated number of <u>minutes</u> it takes to get to work (one-way): | # OF MINUTES = _____ | or NA |
| C. Estimated number of <u>minutes</u> it takes to get home from work:    | # OF MINUTES = _____ | or NA |
4. Which of the following best describes the location of your residence in Illinois? (please circle number)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 City of Chicago                      | 5 Other city of 20,000 to 75,000              |
| 2 Chicago suburbs                      | 6 Other city/village/town of 10,000 to 19,999 |
| 3 Metro East (St. Louis) area suburbs  | 7 Other city/village/town under 10,000        |
| 4 Other metro area of more than 75,000 | 8 Rural area outside of city/village/town     |
5. What Illinois county do you live in? COUNTY = \_\_\_\_\_
6. And, what is your zip code? ZIP CODE = \_\_\_\_\_
7. What is your current age? AGE = \_\_\_\_\_ years
8. What is your gender? Circle number → 1 MALE 2 FEMALE
9. So that we can compare results with previous years, it would be useful to know:
- A. Which of the following best describes your household in terms of having a landline telephone number? (circle number)
- |  |
|--|
| 1 no one in your household has a landline telephone number   |
| 2 at least one person in your household has a landline telephone number which IS LISTED in the telephone directory |
| 3 your household has at least one landline telephone number, but NONE are listed in the telephone directory        |
- B. Does any adult (18 years or older) in your household have a cell phone number? (please circle number)
- 1 YES 2 NO
10. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Circle number.)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 Less than high school diploma                | 4 Community or junior college education |
| 2 High school diploma or G.E.D.                | 5 Some education at 4-yr. college       |
| 3 Trade or technical school beyond high school | 6 Four-year college degree              |
|  | 7 More than 4-year college degree       |
11. Which of these best describes your race/ethnicity? (circle all that apply)
- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 White / Caucasian           | 4 Asian-American                           |
| 2 Black / African-American    | 5 Native American (American Indian)        |
| 3 Hispanic / Latino / Mexican | 6 Not listed – please specify below: _____ |
12. Estimated household income last year before taxes. (Please check box.)
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Less than \$25,000   | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 \$75,000 to \$100,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 \$25,000 to \$49,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 More than \$100,000   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 \$50,000 to \$74,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Don't know            |

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE PROVIDED.**

Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid return envelope.

OR, send it to: Survey Research Office; University of Illinois at Springfield  
One University Plaza, MS HRB 120; Springfield, Illinois 62703-5407

**APPENDIX B**  
**Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2003 to 2008**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>2003 Sample</b>	<b>2004 Sample</b>	<b>2005 Sample</b>	<b>2006 Sample</b>	<b>2007 Sample</b>	<b>2008 Sample</b>
<b>Cooperation rate</b>	44.3%	40.4%	40.1%	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	55%	57%	56%	54%	57%	50%
Female	45%	43%	44%	46%	43%	50%
	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)	(98%)
<b>Age</b>						
16 to 35	16%	15%	15%	13%	12%	16%
36 to 45	19%	18%	18%	16%	14%	28%
46 to 55	21%	22%	20%	22%	21%	20%
56 to 65	19%	19%	21%	22%	23%	21%
66 to 75	13%	15%	15%	15%	18%	18%
Over 75	12%	11%	11%	13%	12%	13%
Mean	53.2 yrs	53.4 yrs	53.9 yrs	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs
Median	53.0 yrs	53.0 yrs	54.0 yrs	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs
	(97%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)
<b>Education</b>						
Up to HS	32%	33%	29%	28%	28%	28%
Post HS	30%	30%	32%	32%	33%	33%
4-yr college	37%	38%	39%	39%	39%	40%
	(98%)	(96%)	(97%)	(97%)	(96%)	(97%)
<b>Income</b>						
< \$25,000	16%	17%	14%	13%	12%	15%
\$25-49,999	30%	31%	27%	27%	26%	24%
\$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%
\$75-100,000	15%	14%	16%	16%	19%	18%
> \$100,000	15%	17%	18%	17%	20%	20%
	(88%)	(83%)	(85%)	(85%)	(85%)	(82%)
Up to \$49,999	46%	48%	41%	40%	38%	39%
\$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%
\$75,000 and up	30%	31%	34%	33%	39%	38%
<b>Miles drive / yr</b>						
Up to 6,000*	21%	20%	19%	23%	19%	23%
6,000+ -12,000	38%	36%	33%	36%	33%	37%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	29%	31%	28%	32%	29%
Over 20,000	14%	16%	16%	13%	15%	11%
Mean	14,459 m (est)	14,795 miles	15,244 miles	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles
Median	12,000 m (est)	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles
	(94%)	(88%)	(90%)	(90%)	(86%)	(90%)

\*Among those who indicated any driving miles. The results in the 2003 report were re-calculated to make this consistent.  
(continued on next page)

**Table 2 (continued)**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>2003 Sample</b>	<b>2004 Sample</b>	<b>2005 Sample</b>	<b>2006 Sample</b>	<b>2007 Sample</b>	<b>2008 Sample</b>
<b>Residential location</b>						
City of Chicago	<i>not comp*</i>	11%	12%	10%	12%	11%
Chicago suburbs	<i>not comp</i>	36%	34%	38%	37%	35%
Metro East	<i>not comp</i>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
City > 75,000	<i>not comp</i>	8%	6%	8%	8%	8%
City 20-75,000	<i>not comp</i>	10%	12%	10%	10%	11%
City/town 10-20,000	<i>not comp</i>	10%	8%	8%	8%	10%
Town < 10,000	<i>not comp</i>	11%	13%	13%	14%	12%
Rural	<i>not comp</i>	11%	10%	9%	10%	10%
		(95%)	(96%)	(96%)	(94%)	(97%)
<b>Commuting</b>						
% giving answer		63%	62%	53-54%	58%	51-52%
<i>Of these:</i>						
avg miles one way to work	<i>na</i>	Mean = 16.8 Med = 13.0	Mean = 17.0 Med = 12.0	Mean = 18.4 Med = 14.2	Mean = 18.2 Med = 14.0	Mean = 15.9** Med = 11.0
avg minutes to work	<i>na</i>	Mean = 30.0 Med = 25.0	Mean = 28.1 Med = 22.0	Mean = 30.2 Med = 25.0	Mean = 31.7 Med = 30.0	Mean = 28.2 Med = 20.0
avg minutes home from work	<i>na</i>	Mean = 32.9 Med = 25.0	Mean = 30.8 Med = 25.0	Mean = 31.1 Med = 30.0	Mean = 35.7 Med = 30.0	Mean = 30.7 Med = 25.0
avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)	<i>na</i>	Mean = 62.9 Med = 50.0	Mean = 58.9 Med = 47.0	Mean = 61.3 Med = 55.0	Mean = 67.4 Med = 60.0	Mean = 59.0 Med = 45.0

\*"not comp" indicates that the residential location question did not produce comparable data in 2003.

"na" indicates that the information is not contained in the 2003 report.

\*\*In the calculation of this 2008 mean, 4 outlier cases were excluded which had average miles of 600 miles or greater.